National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, tests publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

NL-339 (r. 88/04)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ROLE OF THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION IN ALBERTA

BY

ALLAN JAMHA

(C)

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN

PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1988

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-45515-2

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: ALLAN DEAN JAMHA

TITLE OF THESIS: ROLE OF THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION IN ALBERTA

DEGREE: MASTER OF EDUCATION

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1988

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) Allan Jamha

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

8018 - 100 Avenue

Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta

Canada T8L 3K3

Date October 3, 1988

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled ROLE OF THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION IN ALBERTA submitted by ALLAN DEAN JAMHA in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF EDUCATION.

.....

Supervisor

.....

.....

Date: September 26, 1988

ABSTRACT

This study examined the role of minister of education in Alberta, Canada from 1971 to 1986.

Interviews were conducted with three ministers who served during that period, Louis D. Hyndman, Julian G. J. Koziak and David T. King. The ministers' perceptions of the role were supplemented by documented legislative requirements and expectations, and politics and education literature. Attention was paid to the historical, political-legislative, social-economic and educational context in order to provide a perspective for the study.

Six dimensions were explored -- government, Legislature, party, Department of Education, public and personal -- which laid the foundation, in the form of 76 propositions, for a composite picture of the role of minister of education.

Leadership emerged as the central, driving characteristic. As such, the role of minister includes decision-making, goal-direction and policy-setting, persuading, convincing, discussing, consulting, listening, advice-taking, weighing of options and sensitivities, and effecting compromise.

The minister was seen as being in the center ring of education performing a balancing act involving formal requirements, informal expectations and personal objectives.

In terms of formal requirements, the minister was viewed as the chief spokesperson on education for the government and was responsible to the Cabinet, the Legislature, and ultimately, the citizens of the province.

The participants perceived that common informal expectations for the minister by significant others (teachers, trustees, parents, media, opposition parties, other interest groups and the general public) included support and sympathy for diverse positions on education, extensive knowledge about education, immediate response to questions, acknowledgement of the legitimate role of certain interest groups, fairness, justice, honesty, and advocacy for, and commitment to, education and children.

In terms of behavior, it was deemed important that the minister be a good communicator and listener, accessible, approachable, empathetic, open, forthright, and trustworthy. How the minister plays out the role within each dimension may be the most important factor in determining how he or she is perceived as an educational leader.

This study adds to the knowledge of the politics and organization of education in Canada. Researchers need to corroborate these findings and expand the scope of investigation by studying the perceptions of other former and present ministers of education in Canada and of significant others in education about the role of minister.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people helped make this study possible, enjoyable and worthwhile.

I wish to thank Dr. Walter H. Worth, my supervisor, for all his valuable assistance, counsel, and friendship throughout this endeavor. His knowledge of politics and education, his encouragement to me to explore uncharted waters, and his ability to help me find ways to express myself and focus my work are very much appreciated.

My gratitude is extended to Dr. R. Gordon McIntosh and Dr. Henry W. Hodysh, who served on my oral examination committee and committed many hours to reading and commenting on my thesis.

I am especially grateful to Lou D. Hyndman, Julian G. J. Koziak and David T. King for their participation in the study. Without their willing cooperation this work would not have been possible.

I am indebted to my many colleagues in the Department of Educational Administration who, whether teachers or fellow students, gave their time freely to review and constructively criticize the thesis throughout its many twists and turns. My gratitude is also extended to those outside the department for their assistance, in particular Dr. Stan C. T. Clarke, for his encouragement, and Dr. Gordon R. Thomas and E. Peter Lougheed for their reviews and comments on sections of the final drafts.

I also gratefully acknowledge the financial assistance of The Alberta Teachers' Association, which provided me the opportunity to continue my education.

Finally, to my wife Bonnie, who has lived with this thesis spread throughout the house for more than a year, I extend my love and appreciation for her unwavering support and belief in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Significance of the Study	2
Perspective	3
Delimitations	5
Assumptions	5
Limitations	5
Definition of Terms	6
Organization of the Thesis	8
II. RELATED LITERATURE AND INTERPRETIVE FRAMEWORK	10
Doctrine of Ministerial Responsibility	10
Interpretive Framework	12
Government Dimension	13
Legislature Dimension	18
Party Dimension	20
Department of Education Dimension	22
Public Dimension	31
Personal Dimension	37
Summary	41
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	42
Nature and Sources of Data	42
Collection of Data	51

Analysis of Data 55
Summary 57

IV. CONTEXT 58
Historical Perspective, 1867 to 1971 58
September 1971 to April 1975, Hyndman 65
April 1975 to March 1979, Koziak 72
March 1979 to February 1986, King 80
Summary 89

V. FINDINGS 90
Government Dimension 91
Legislature Dimension 105
Party Dimension 115
Department of Education Dimension 123
Public Dimension 142
Personal Dimension 155
Summary 165

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS 166
Summary 166
Conclusion 181
Implications 186

BIBLIOGRAPHY 188

APPENDIX 1. CORRESPONDENCE 199
APPENDIX 2. INTERVIEW GUIDE 206
APPENDIX 3. STATEMENT ON PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST 214

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	Ministers of Education in Alberta	39

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study examines the role of provincial ministers of education in Canada. It is based on perceptions of three former ministers of education who occupied the position in Alberta from 1971 to 1986 and on the documented requirements and expectations for the role as described in legislation and elsewhere.

The position of minister of education is at the apex of the governing organization of basic education in each province and territory in Canada. As such it is crucial to the organization and well being of the education system. Strangely enough it is also a position that has received little attention from researchers. It is hoped that this study provides a start at rectifying that state of affairs.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to investigate the role of minister of education in Alberta from 1971 to 1986.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS

To help achieve this purpose, five specific problems were formulated:

1. What were the salient features of the context within which the ministers of education in Alberta carried out their roles?

2. What were the role requirements of the position of minister of education in Alberta from 1971 to 1986 in terms of:

a) formal prescription?

b) informal expectations?

3. How did the minister of education in Alberta translate the role requirements into action?

4. What were the common elements of the role requirements and the role behavior among the three ministers of education who held the position from 1971 to 1986?

5. What composite picture of the role of minister of education emerges?

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The role of minister of education has received little attention for three reasons. First, researchers have been reluctant to study the political aspects of organizations, partly as a result of the absence of a framework within which to conduct such an examination. Second, the transitory nature of political incumbents make them difficult to study. A third reason is the prescriptive delineation of the position in the statutes relating to provincial jurisdiction over education which often gives rise to the belief that the role of minister of education is adequately described therein.

This lack of attention highlights the theoretical and practical significance of this study. From a theoretical viewpoint, the study may result in a replicable framework within which other political leaders in education and in other fields may be studied. In practical terms, the study is intended to contribute to the literature on educational governance. By taking a historical perspective, the study may add to knowledge about the political aspects of education in the past. It may also lead to a better understanding of the role of the minister of education in the present. By providing insights into the practical workings of government as they relate to education in the province of Alberta, the study may help educators and others in the community who have occasion to interact with the office of the minister of education.

PERSPECTIVE

As a way of examining the role of minister of education, each of these specific problems has been considered from the perspective of the integration of political and organizational theory.

In the introduction to his work on the structure and processes of modern government, Self (1977, p. 9) states that

> Neither classical organisation theory nor the "human relations" school paid much attention to politics. Even today organisational studies are dominated by social psychology, economics, and quantitative techniques. In recent years the importance of internal group politics for organisational behavior has been better recognised, and should be linked with the growing interest of political scientists in the way that public authorities adapt their policies to environmental pressures. . . . Understanding the administrative system requires a better integration of political and organisational theories.

The position of provincial minister of education is at once a political one concerned with allocating power on behalf of the government, and an administrative one sitting, as it does, at the top of the bureaucratic organization of the provincial education system. Self (1977, p. 149) suggests that "the conventional view of the relationship between politics and administration is that of one between ends and means." Narrowly defined, politics refers to "the allocation and use of power by the state or by elected officials" (Self, 1977, p. 149). In its broader sense, politics refers to "any or all conflict among human beings over the allocation of power, wealth or prestige, when interests are pursued by means other than the use of physical violence" (Stevenson, 1985, p. 1446). Politics may also be defined as "the set of interactions that influence and shape the authoritative allocation of values" (Worth, 1986, p. 1).

Sergiovanni, Burlingame, Coombs and Thurston (1980, p. 5) define administration generally as "the process of working with and through others to efficiently accomplish organizational goals." They add that "some theorists, most notably Chester Barnard,

Herbert Simon and Dan Griffiths, define administration with a shift of emphasis from 'doing' to 'deciding'. For them administration is the art and science of decision-making." Hoy and Miskel (1982, p. 9-10) quote Simon as saying that "administration is the process of rational decision-making that influences the behavior of members of the organization." In offering their own definition, Hoy and Miskel believe that "administration is the performance of the decision-making process by an individual or group in an organizational context." Sergiovanni (1980, p. 70) believes it is "describing, explaining, analyzing, and predicting organizational phenomena and human behavior as they relate to the accomplishment of organizational goals." Adding the important dimension of context to this understanding allows consideration of theories about effective administrative behavior such as Fiedler's "contingency theory" which "focuses on how leaders can best facilitate performance by manipulating power, leader-member relations and task clarity or structuring" (Steers, 1981, p. 269). At the junction of political theory and administrative theory, Self (1977, p. 149) suggests that "the conventional view of administration is that it is concerned with translating into practice political decisions which are independently derived from other sources."

Within the particular realm of educational politics and administration, the political and administrative aspects of the activities of the minister of education are manifest in the government, Legislature, political party, Department of Education, public, and personal dimensions of the role that this study explores. By viewing these dimensions through two lenses simultaneously, the researcher considered such political activities as governing, legislating, controlling, and influencing, while, at the same, time looking at such administrative activities as planning, organizing, leading, policy-making, implementing, communicating, and evaluating. The reason for doing so was to better understand their interrelationship and to draw a composite description of the role of the minister of education in Alberta as a Canadian politician and as the chairman of the board of the provincial education system.

DELIMITATIONS

The study was delimited to the three ministers of education in Alberta who held the position from September 10, 1971, to February 6, 1986. The three were Louis Davis Hyndman, who served from September 10, 1971, to April 3, 1975; Julian Gregory Josaphat Koziak, who served from April 3, 1975, to March 23, 1979; and David Thomas King, who served from March 23, 1979, to February 6, 1986.

ASSUMPTIONS

The major assumptions underlying this study were that the participants would accurately recollect and describe the role of minister of education for the period in which they held that position, that the participants would be predisposed to be truthful, and that the researcher would not allow personal biases to affect his reporting of the responses.

LIMITATIONS

A major limitation of this study was the restricted sample of ministers chosen to be interviewed. Each performed that role during the period in which the Progressive Conservative Party governed Alberta. This limitation makes it difficult to generalize the results to previous ministers who were in other governments or to current and future ministers of education. This limitation is seen both as a strength (in that the findings focus on a particular party and may reveal how its policies and philosophies affected the minister's perception of the role) and a weakness (in that the conclusions may not be applicable to ministers of education who are members of other political parties).

A second limitation was the problem of accessing unpublished material related to the informal expectations of the Premier, the Cabinet, and the Caucus. Valuable information about the internal workings of government had been gathered from the course Political Science 421 (A Practical Insights Into the Workings of Government) taken by the researcher at the University of Alberta. The course was taught by E. P. Lougheed, M. Leitch, and R. Farran, all of whom were in the Cabinet during the period that this study

covers. In addition, contact was made early in the data collection phase with the then minister of education for Alberta, N. J. Betkowski, and her executive assistant, D. Osbaldeston, who provided valuable information on the current structure and responsibilities of the government committees and operation. These sources helped to minimize the access to information limitation.

A third limitation was the potential prejudicial impact of perception, or what Johnson (1987, p. 209) calls "the understanding of the world that you construct from data obtained through your senses." This limitation applied not only to the perceptions of the three primary participants who would be trying to recall their pasts as ministers of education, but also to the researcher's own perceptions, which could potentially prejudice how the data was collected, analyzed, and reported (1987, p. 219). Johnson's suggestions for overcoming the negative effects of perception were incorporated into the research design and are elaborated upon in Chapter III.

A fourth limitation was the use of interviews as the primary method of data collection for the study. Measor (1985) suggests that this limitation can be substantially overcome by careful planning and interviewer training. This limitation was minimized by such devices as building a sound relationship with the interviewees, developing trust and acceptance, establishing rapport, and being critically aware of responses made by the participants. These techniques were incorporated into the research design and reported in Chapter III.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Gross, Mason, and McEachern (1958, p. 11-20) surveyed the literature for definitions of role and found considerable differences in how terms were used, depending on the discipline of the definer. They added:

> Another reason for some of the differences in definition is simply semantic; the same phenomena are frequently given different names. Thus what Linton and Newcomb define as

> a role, Davis defines as a status. What Davis defines as a role, Newcomb calls role behavior and Sarbin, role enactment. (p. 17)

Building on the work of Sargent, Rousseau (1968, p. 34) defined role as follows:

> "Situationally appropriate" behavior will refer to an incumbent's perception of the expectations held for him by significant others as modified by personal needs and his perceptions of his behavior under specific conditions.

Lundberg, Schrag, Larsen, and Catton (1968, p. 145) distinguished between role prescriptions and role expectations, as distinct from behavior:

> Role prescriptions: Formal laws, rules, and regulations, usually written, and enforced by official rewards and penalties.
>
> Role expectations: Informal codes of etiquette or propriety, often unwritten, and enforced by unofficial means, such as ostracism, ridicule, respect, prestige, and so forth.

Dahl (1984, p. 16) indicates that "patterns [of expectation] . . . in which a number of people share roughly similar expectations about behavior in particular situations, are called roles." He also notes that

> political roles are played by persons who create, interpret, and enforce rules that are binding on members of the political system . . . [and] roles remain much the same when they are played by a succession of individuals. (p. 16)

For the purpose of this study the following definitions were adopted:

Position: the location of a person or class of persons in a system of social relationships.

Role: the combination of what a person is or is not supposed to do (requirements) and what a person actually does (behavior).

Role Requirements: the formal prescription of the role as set out in statutes and other legal descriptions plus the informal expectations of significant others.

Role Behavior: actions performed and interactions conducted by the person occupying the role.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This chapter outlined the purpose of the study of minister of education in terms of five specific problems related to role requirements, expectations, and behavior leading to the development of a composite picture of the position in Alberta from 1971 to 1986. A perspective for viewing the role based on the interrelationship of political and organizational theory was presented, followed by an explanation of the practical and theoretical significance of the study. The primary participants were identified, and the special ethical considerations relating to them were explored. Assumptions, delimitations and limitations underlying the work were set out, and the key terms used in the study were defined.

The remainder of the thesis is organized into five chapters. Chapter II explores the literature related to the role of a minister in Canadian government, particularly in terms of the doctrine of ministerial responsibility, which underlies our parliamentary tradition. Starting from this doctrine, an interpretive framework based on six dimensions of the role is sketched out as the basis for analyzing the findings in Chapter V. The chapter concludes by examining the professional literature specifically related to elements of the six dimensions, such as the relationships of a minister with public servants in the Department of Education. Chapter III elaborates on the research design used for the study, including a description of the nature and sources of data, with special attention to the matter of trustworthiness, methods employed for data collection, and details of how the interpretive framework was applied to the data analysis. Chapter IV attempts to answer the first specific question of the study by briefly describing the features of the historical, political-legislative, social-economic and educational context in which the three primary participants occupied their positions. Chapter V presents the major findings of the study based on the results of the interviews. The results are organized around six dimensions of the role, thus

providing answers to the second and third specific problems regarding role requirements and role behavior. As a way of highlighting similar features, a series of propositions (low level generalizations based on limited empirical evidence) about the role of minister of education are extracted at the end of each dimension. The final chapter summarizes the study, draws together all the propositions and paints a composite picture of the role of minister of education in Alberta as the conclusion of the work. Chapter VI ends by suggesting practical and methodological implications of the study and by offering ideas for further research. The bibliography lists the documents cited in the study, and the appendices provide copies of the correspondence with the primary participants, the interview guide, and the statement of public disclosure of interest by ministers.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE AND INTERPRETIVE FRAMEWORK

By reviewing the literature on the role of minister of education, this chapter provides a backdrop for interpreting the study documents and interview findings. Following consideration of the traditional doctrine of ministerial responsibility as the basis of Canada's parliamentary system, an interpretive framework is established to consider the specific dimensions of the role of minister of education in the provincial milieu. Each dimension is then elaborated using the available literature.

DOCTRINE OF MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The doctrine of ministerial responsibility underlies the parliamentary system of responsible government. Kernaghan (1985 pp. 281-2) believes that, at the federal level in Canada, the doctrine embraces two interrelated conventions: collective responsibility and individual responsibility. Applying Kernaghan's views about collective responsibility to provincial governments implies that the premier and the Cabinet must resign or ask the Lieutenant Governor in Council for a dissolution of the Legislative Assembly if the Assembly passes a vote of no confidence in the government. For a minister in the government, collective responsibility means "that the minister must support government decisions in public or at least suppress any public criticism of them. If a minister finds a particular decision unacceptable, he must either stifle his objections or submit his resignation" (Kernaghan, 1985, p. 281).

The second convention is that of individual ministerial responsibility which, according to Kernaghan (1985, p. 282), has two major components: answerability--an obligation to explain and defend the actions of his department to the Legislative Assembly--and personal responsibility--an obligation to resign in the event of a serious error by his department.

The doctrine does not simply lie beneath the surface of Canadian politics. It has been the subject of considerable discussion in recent times, including consideration by the Royal Commission on Financial Management and Accountability in March 1979. "According to the commissioners , the doctrine of ministerial responsibility is 'a cornerstone' of the Canadian constitution; ' . . . it identifies who has the final responsibility for decisions taken--the minister, and provides a forum in which he is publicly accountable --Parliament"(Kernaghan, 1985, p. 354). If one were to substitute "Legislative Assembly" for "Parliament", the doctrine would presumably apply equally well to the minister of education in Alberta.

Kernaghan quotes the 1977 Report of the Government of Canada Committee on the Concept of the Ombudsman:

> Recent constitutional experience suggests that it is unrealistic to hold a minister personally accountable for every aspect of administration [of his department]. . . . [However], he must certainly accept full responsibility for matters done properly under his instructions or in accordance with his policy. (1985, p. 378)

Kernaghan believes that, while the resignation aspect of the doctrine has all but been ignored by Canadian governments (except, of course, in the case of personal misdeeds by a minister), the answerability component is strong and well. Hodgetts (1985a, p. 251) is less optimistic about answerability, suggesting that "the dwindling ability of the Legislature to hold the executive accountable has had a debilitating effect on the disciplinary impact of the doctrine of collective and ministerial responsibility to the

Legislature, a doctrine upon which rests the whole notion of responsible government." On this last point the two writers agree. Kernaghan (1985, p. 288) concludes that, as a fundamental basis on which ministers define their responsibilities as members of the government,

> the concept of ministerial responsibility helps define and determine how power is and should be exercised in the Canadian political system and who is and should be held responsible for the exercise of that power. It provides a major frame of reference for the allocation of power and responsibility among ministers, legislators and public servants.

While the doctrine may not be strictly adhered to in Canada, it is nontheless the basis of the parliamentary system. As such, it provides the introduction for the rest of this chapter and the foundation for the interpretive framework presented in the next section.

INTERPRETIVE FRAMEWORK

To effectively investigate the role of minister of education, to facilitate the collection of data, and to provide an interpretive framework within which to paint a composite picture of minister of education, six dimensions of the role were identified: government, Legislature, party, Department of Education, public, and personal. The dimensions were derived from the literature on the workings of government in Canada and from the researcher's observations of the political process in Alberta. Separating the role of minister of education into these six dimensions was, of course, artificial. In reality, no clear boundaries exist between any of the dimensions; the minister often wears many hats at the same time. A minister's activities as a member of the Cabinet, Caucus, or the Priorities Committee are interconnected with the duties as MLA and party member; communications from the minister's office in the Legislature building are heard simultaneously by opposition members, the public, teachers, trustees, and Department of Education officials; policy pronouncements affect the whole school system; and the personal goals and

aspirations of a particular minister are visible in all dimensions. Nontheless, an arbitrary division of role dimensions was a useful way of managing the data and of providing an opportunity to examine particular aspects of the role that might otherwise be overlooked if the position of minister were viewed in its entirety.

Within these six dimensions of the role, the formally prescribed requirements, the informal expectations, and the role behavior of the minister of education could be examined from the perspective of the integration of political and organizational theory, as described in Chapter I. Examining each dimension in this way allows the political and administrative differences and similarities among the three primary participants to emerge and to be considered in the particular context within which each participant operated while minister. From these findings, common elements can then be extracted and developed into propositions as the basis of constructing a composite picture of the role of minister of education in Alberta.

This interpretive framework was applied during the study. The first level of the framework --dimensions-- has been used throughout the rest of this chapter to outline the nature of the role of a minister as described in the literature. Notwithstanding the work done in British Columbia that has been reported by Robinson, Cree and Giles (1988), specific references to the role of minister of education in Alberta or to the role of minister of education generally, are sparse. This limitation has been minimized by assuming that the literature dealing with the federal Canadian scene is sufficiently generic to be applied to the provincial context. Where particular differences exist and are known, they have been identified.

GOVERNMENT DIMENSION

For the purposes of this study, the first dimension to be explored is the role of minister of education in the government. This dimension broadly includes the incumbent's activities as a member of the Cabinet (executive committee), the Caucus, and the

committees or task forces associated with these two bodies. This dimension also encompasses the minister's activities as a government representative outside the province.

Cabinet

In addressing the role of ministers, the 1963 Royal Commission on Government Organization noted that

> as members of the Cabinet, their principal obligation is to reflect and give effect to the collective point of view in drawing together the public interests, attitudes and aspirations that find expression in the political process, and, by reconciling these, providing the basis for an essential unity of government on policy and action (Willms, 1985, p. 108).

As a member of the government and particularly as a member of the Cabinet, the minister of education has a significant role to play as one of the inner circle of decision makers. Even when the Legislative Assembly is not in session, the government is run by the Cabinet, which continues to hold regular meetings and has the power to make regulations and spend money.

Moreover, as Smiley (1980, pp. 91-92) observes,

> in the Canadian system of government the executive has a very wide scope of discretion--freedom from effective control of the elected Legislature, of party organizations and, in most circumstances, of private interest groups. Under normal circumstances the Canadian political system is characterized by "a collective central energizing executive as the key engine of the state" and this characteristic applies to both federal and provincial governments.

Central control by Cabinet is, for the most part, true, but in recent years there has been a move to expand the decision-making circle. Matheson (1985, p. 279) believes that this has happened partly as a result of attempts to reduce the influence of the civil service in policy-

making and to admit other groups to the decision-making process, while still leaving the prime role in policy making to the executive. This move has included the increased involvement of non-Cabinet Caucus members and, on another level, of major interest groups.

Caucus

The involvement of the entire Caucus in the decision-making process is not without precedence in Alberta. The government Caucus comprises all government MLAs, including the members of the Cabinet. In 1975, the Conservative government substantially increased the involvement of non-Cabinet members of the Caucus (backbench or private government MLAs) in the decision-making process by establishing a number of Caucus Committees, including one for education. In a sense, this was the tangible recognition of a promise made by E. P. Lougheed in one of his first memoranda to the new government MLAs on September 7, 1971, in which he said, "Please be assured that the new government is a government team of 49 members and that each and everyone[sic] one of you will be fully involved and given an opportunity to participate" (Lougheed, 1971a). In a May 22, 1975 news release, Lougheed (1975) noted that

> the formation of these Caucus Committees will afford government MLAs an opportunity to carry out their responsibility as elected representatives more effectively by participating more in specific policy development and working in an advisory capacity to appropriate Ministers . . . and as a filter of proposed legislation. These Committees should also initiate new legislative proposals.

Following reelection in 1979, E. P. Lougheed reappointed the committees and institutionalized their place in the decision-making process. He was thoroughly convinced of the correctness of this move as illustrated by the first sentence in his news release of May 14, 1979, which read, "The formation of these Caucus Committees with their involvement of the MLAs is a most important part of this government's decision-making

process." The committee functions continued to be all those set out in 1975 but now included the opportunity to initiate new policy proposals for presentation to the whole Caucus. While this would appear to be another inroad into the decision-making process, in reality it was only partly so. According to the Premier (Lougheed, 1987), the Caucus adopted these proposals only 50% of the time, especially if a committee was not unanimous in its report. Unless approved by the Caucus, the proposals had virtually no chance of reaching the Cabinet agenda.

In addition to the official reasons given for this increased involvement of Caucus members, a former Cabinet minister says that, prior to the Conservative election of 1971, and up until the election of 1975, ministers had a great deal of discretionary power to make announcements and decide courses of action on their own. "After 1975, Lougheed clamped down on independent actions by ministers. He introduced the Caucus Committee system to cool down what he thought were overheated ministers and to give the other members of Caucus something to do" (Farran, 1987).

The other major change to the Caucus Committees' terms of reference in 1979 was to make committees responsible for receiving presentations and briefs from groups and individuals. This newest duty was previously the responsibility of the Cabinet policy committees; in the case of education, the Social Planning Committee, consisted only of the minister of education and selected other members of Cabinet. Engelmann (1987, p. 24) notes that "while many of these organizations preferred to meet, as they did earlier, with Cabinet or Cabinet committees, the 1979 reform is, while not a beefing up of the Assembly as a whole, a strengthening of its government members."

External Representation

> One of the great Canadian myths is the oftentimes assertion that provinces are masters in their own houses when it comes to education. . . Canada's constitution, however, does not prohibit the federal government from becoming involved in education. Its involvement dates back to the 1870's and has increased ever since. (Bergen, 1979, p. 25)

Most federal involvement is in the form of conditional grants to the provinces; decisions about whether to accept such grants are the prerogative of the provincial government of the day. As the province's chief spokesperson for education, the minister is required to meet with representatives of the federal government to discuss the administration of these grants and the programs envisioned, and to consider the implications of this kind of federal involvement in education. This responsibility has expanded over the years as the amount of money has increased and as federal--provincial issues have emerged. Although some of the duties have been delegated to officials in the Department of Education and the treasury, the minister is still directly involved.

In addition to being discussed as part of the debate over the British North America Act in1867, federal involvement in education has also been a topic of discussion at interprovincial meetings of educators from as early as 1892 when the first meeting of the Canadian Education Association (CEA) was held, an organization to which many provincial ministers belong today. Over the years, federal involvement began to be looked on as federal intrusion, and, according to Bergen (1979, p. 26),

> this resulted in increasing concern on the part of the provinces and gave birth to the need to establish some cooperative way of dealing with it. Ministers of Education began meeting as a committee at the annual meetings of CEA, since 1961. Their deliberations resulted in a search for a model which might serve the purposes of Canadian provinces.

As a result of these discussions the Canadian Council of Ministers of Education was established in 1967. Its general goals are

> 1. to enable the ministers to consult on matters of common interest;
> 2. to provide a means for cooperation among provinces in areas of mutual interest;
> 3. to serve functions with respect to coordination, information and liaison at interprovincial, provincial-federal, and international levels. (Bergen, 1979, p. 26).

The minister then has direct involvement with the federal government, with other provincial ministers, and with the Canadian Council of Ministers of Education. In addition there is nothing to preclude the minister from involvement with ministries of education and governments in other countries or indeed involvement with international educational organizations. Indeed, at various times in Alberta, fact finding missions abroad have been the order of the day.

LEGISLATURE DIMENSION

For the purposes of this study, the Legislature dimension of the role of minister of education broadly refers to the incumbent's activities in the Legislative Assembly and involves his or her relationships with other members of the government, the opposition, the Speaker and with his or her constituents.

As a member of the Legislative Assembly, the minister of education sits not only as the government's chief education spokesperson but also as the representative of his or her constituency. While owing some special allegiance to the party members who worked on the election campaign, the MLA, once elected, is expected to represent the collective view of all citizens in the contituency, regardless of party affiliation. The responsibilities as MLA are therefore ongoing, despite the duties associated with the position of minister. In the Legislative Assembly, the incumbent must at once wear the hats of minister, MLA, and party member. For example, the minister might rise to announce government policy on special education, then debate the merits of moving the correspondence school out of his home constituency to Barrhead and then chide the opposition for not understanding the world according to Conservative philosophy, all the time following the rules, decorum and tradition of the Legislature.

Ruff (1985, p. 1500) says that "a Provincial Legislature is defined, for lawmaking purposes, as being composed of the lieutenant-governor and the Provincial Legislative Assembly." In Alberta, the Legislative Assembly derives its authority from the Legislative

Assembly Act. The Speaker is the presiding officer and head of the administrative structure.

> The Legislature's principal functions are to authorize the collection and spending of money, to create laws and to act as a forum where the government may be questioned on its policies and actions [by the opposition]. As an elected body it is responsible to the people to protect the minority while carrying out the wishes of the majority. (Alberta Teachers' Association, 1986, p. 1)

Within the public forum of the Legislative Assembly, the role of the minister is to debate and defend the education budget estimates, introduce major pieces of education legislation, announce government policy on education, field the questions from the opposition, and be accountable for education matters conducted by the government. All this must be done within the rules of conduct set out by the Speaker.

The matter of accountability in the Legislature has been the topic of much discussion among political observers in Alberta. This has been principally due to the almost perpetual lack of any substantial opposition in the Alberta Legislature. Engelmann (1987, p. 2) sums up the situation most aptly when he suggests that "Alberta is characterized by being short on opposition and short on legislative tradition." While the Legislature is the legitimate senior authority of law in the provinces, the dominance of the executive committee of government in lawmaking has, according to some writers, effectively reduced the Legislature to a place where question period occurs and where legislation is ceremoniously approved. "Though the Legislative Assembly is superior to the government, the division of the House into Caucuses and the maintenance of strict party loyalty give the government virtually unfettered power" (ATA, 1986, p. 12). Engelmann (1987, p. 18) agrees, saying "Historically, accountability has not been writ large in a Legislative Assembly which has almost always been under the complete domination of the governing party." In the broader Canadian context, Ruff (1985, p. 1500) also concurs,

noting that "with the modern emphasis on executive government, the lawmaking powers of Cabinet and of its individual ministers is[sic] considerable."

Notwithstanding these concerns about the effectiveness of the Legislative Assembly, question period still provides the window through which most Albertans and their media observe the work of government. Question period is also the time when the Opposition is most visible. Here is another view of question period:

> The first hour of each day--"the daily feast of partisanship and newsmaking"--is marked by an ongoing struggle for publicity. Publicity wins votes. This is the time for ministerial announcements, and the time for the opposition to dig for administrative bungles, misdirected policies and flagrant violations of all that is decent. (ATA, 1986, p. 66)

Opposition in the Legislative Assembly comprises the Official Opposition, usually the political party with the largest number of seats next to the government, and other non-government members who may or may not be aligned to a particular party. "The principal roles of the opposition are to question government policies and actions and to propose alternatives" (ATA,1986, p. 10).

The activities of the minister of education form a significant part of the public view of the role, particularly with regard to question period in the Assembly which is broadcast on radio and television. The role also includes relationships with other MLAs on both sides of the Assembly, the Speaker, and others who make up the Legislature.

PARTY DIMENSION

The third dimension is the role of minister of education as a member of the political party that forms the government. This dimension includes the role requirements and role behavior of the minister in relation to party philosophy, policy and practices, including involvement at party meetings and with party officials.

A minister's membership in the political party that forms the government is traditionally a prerequisite in Canada. Although this does not hold strictly true in the case of coalition governments, exceptions are so rare that they may be ignored for the purposes of this study.

A party can only become the government if it is elected. Hence, for a minister, activities in the party dimension relate primarily to getting and staying elected. According to Farran (1987) and Lougheed (1987), such activities include answering questions from party officials, responding to member requests for information, solving problems, attending general party meetings, attending meetings of the constituency association to ensure one's renomination, helping to choose the leader, discussing relations with the federal party, helping to build the party membership and structure, being involved in election campaigns, both one's own and of other party members, and discussing and helping to formulate party philosophy and policy.

All three former ministers who participated in this study belonged to the Alberta Progressive Conservative Party while in office. Therefore, a note on Canadian conservativism is important as background.

> Virtually all Canadian political parties aim to promote objectives compatible with liberal-democatic values and hope to obtain their ends by achieving power through constitutional means within a parliamentary system of government. (Christian, 1985, p. 369)

> [Canadian conservatism] has remained traditional and constitutional, progressive and pragmatic. It has concerned itself with sound administration of existing laws rather that the forming of new laws, and with economic development rather that political reform. (Morton cited by Taylor, 1985, p. 404)

> Although the Progressive Conservative Party attracts its share of right-wing idealogues, Conservative governments since MacDonald's have launched social-welfare programs and many public enterprises . . .
> At its worst, Canadian conservatism has been conformist and authoritarian, insufficiently appreciating Canada's racial and regional diversities. Conservative dedication to peace,

> order and good government has evoked a popular impression of conservatives (and especially Progressive Conservatives) as a privileged elite--white, Protestant and largely affluent. At its best, however, Canadian conservatism has been compassionate and pragmatic, eschewing ideology in favour of a careful balance between the conflicting claims of social order and individual liberty. (Taylor, 1985, p. 404).

There are few, if any, formal requirements of the party that directly impinge on the position of minister of education. However, the informal expectations of party officials and members on the incumbent as a Cabinet member, the expectations of the party as a whole in terms of leadership and direction on educational policy, and the particular political philosophy a minister holds may be significant in terms of time, substance, and the direction the minister takes on particular issues. These factors may also affect the minister's role in the next area to be explored, the Department of Education dimension.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION DIMENSION

The fourth dimension to be explored, the minister of education's role in relation to the Department of Education, encompasses the responsibilities and activities of the minister in relation to the department in general and to the deputy minister and other staff of the department in particular.

The Minister and the Department

By statute the minister is responsible for the Department of Education, but what does this actually entail? Willms (1985, p. 108) describes the role of minister at the federal level as follows:

> As heads of departments, it is the task of ministers to define the ends to be pursued, and to instill their own sense of purpose and urgency in the permanent officials. . . . Each minister is responsible to Parliament for the operation of his department and by convention the act of every public servant in the department is regarded as the act of the minister.

At the provincial level, while the minister does provide direction and leadership to the department, this does not imply continuous interaction.

> Though ministers traditionally interfere little in the daily operation of departments, leaving administrative responsibility to the deputy minister, they remain responsible for the actions of departmental staff. The minister primarily provides policy and program direction to the deputy minister and calls on him for advice. The deputy is an appointed government official; he and departmental staff provide continuity from one government to the next (ATA, 1986, p. 13)

Rousseau (1968, p. 24) in his study of deputy ministers in the four Western provinces suggested that

> in any large-scale organization, which departments of education are, the head is forced to delegate the actual performance of many of his duties to others. This is especially true of a Cabinet minister upon whose time there are heavy demands for ceremonial, social, political, and representative functions on behalf of his constituency.

While the delegation of certain responsibilities is true for ministers of education in Alberta, Rousseau focussed on deputy ministers, and therefore he did not elaborate those aspects of the minister's role that are retained by the politician.

Kernaghan (1985, pp. 361-362) has this to say about one such aspect of the role:

> It is evident that neither the Cabinet nor individual ministers can exercise their delegated powers solely on their own. For example, a minister could not be expected to decide upon every application for a licence. Thus statutes often permit the Cabinet and ministers either expressly or "necessary intendment", to subdelegate authority.

The demands on the minister's time suggested by Rousseau and illustrated by Kernaghan are in fact extensive. Commenting on the federal level again, Kernaghan

(1985, p. 354) offers that "the present workload of ministers precludes any significant increase in their answerability to Parliament." The time demands and the actual responsibilities of the minister of education in Alberta were explored in this study, and the findings included in Chapter V.

Relationship of the Minister with Public Servants

Kernaghan (1985), Hehner (1985), and others such as Michelmann and Steeves (1985) have studied the relationship of politicians to public servants at the federal level. Most of the discussion centers on the principle of political neutrality of the bureaucracy, but it also deals with the delegation of authority and acceptance of responsibility.

In regard to political neutrality of civil servants, an excellent summary of the traditional doctrine is presented by Kernaghan (1985, p. 259). He discusses these six major elements:

> a) politics and policy are separated from administration; thus politicians make policy decisions; public servants execute these decisions;
>
> b) public servants are appointed and promoted on the basis of merit rather than on the basis of party affiliation or contributions;
>
> c) public servants do not engage in partisan political activities;
>
> d) public servants do not express publicly their personal views on government policies or administration;
>
> e) public servants provide forthright and objective advice to their political masters in private and in confidence; in return, political exectuives protect the anonymity of public servants by publicly accepting responsibility for departmental decisions; and
>
> f) public servants execute policy decisions loyally and zealously irrespective of the philosophy and programs of the party in power and regardless of their personal opinions; as a result, public servants enjoy security of tenure during good behavior and satisfactory performance.

It should be noted that Kernaghan qualifies his use of the word political by saying that it "is not used in the narrow sense of partisan activities, it is used in the broad sense of involvement in the authoritative allocation of social values." In assessing the exercise of this doctrine on the Canadian scene, Kernaghan (1985, p. 266) draws two conclusions:

> a) public servants are more active participants in the political process than the traditional doctrine of political neutrality suggests; [and]
> b) this participation accounts in large part for the nature and extent of the power which public servants exercise in contemporary Canadian government.

d'Aquino (1984) suggests that, at the federal level, political neutrality differs in practice from the theoretical foundations noted by Kernaghan primarily because of an increased number of partisan political appointments to senior civil service positions. Examples he cites are the relaxation of the prohibition on civil servants to stand for public office, to attend political meetings, and to make financial contributions to political parties. The principle of anonymity has changed, as well, in that many senior civil servants are known to the public and the media. He adds that there has also been "an erosion of the principle that ministers will shield their officials from public attack" (1984, p. 24). However, not everything has changed:

> The advice offered by public servants to ministers in most cases continues to be bound in secrecy, thus effectively removing it from scrutiny and challenge. This remains one of the most important sources of public service power and influence. . . ministers must be able to count on objective advice proffered by their senior public service advisors (d'Aquino, 1984, pp. 24-25)

d'Aquino (1984) believes that political neutrality or non-partisanship of civil servants not only should be strengthened in the direction of restoring the basic principles of

the doctrine but should be supplemented by other organized advice to Cabinet, particularly political advice. In addition, he would like to see Parliament given the wherewithal to

> exact, of both the executive and, by implication, the public service, the accountability we all expect. In politics and administration, as in so many things, power should be dispersed, power should be balanced, and those who exercise power must be accountable. (1984, p. 26)

Savoie (1983) tackles the problem of permanent deputy ministers having too much influence on ministers. Again referring to the federal scene, he suggests that ministers do not have access to the necessary outside expertise to challenge the "conventional wisdom of their departments" (1983, p. 522). His solution is to allow ministers to draw on experts from the private sector and the academic community who would be attached to the ministers offices for a fixed period with full access to all the people the senior civil servants have. In addition, he proposes to bring to the office selected groups of senior officials as the secretariat, not as just a "think-tank" group (1983, p. 522). He claims that such a scheme would considerably strengthen the hand of the ministers in dealing with their departments and would allow the minister to take an objective view of the advice provided by his deputy and department staff. The benefits he claims are that the minister would be more comfortable with the policy decisions made and with the department officials with which he or she has to work and would probably issue clearer and firmer policy directions (1983, pp. 523-24). The debate continues, and it has been joined by former politicians.

In her article "The Minister and the Mandarins," F. I. MacDonald (1980), a Cabinet minister in the Clarke and Mulroney governments, provides a rare insight into the working relationships between ministers and their chief public servants. She suggests that ministers need protection.

> Without some such protective mechanisms, the Minister is indeed at the mercy of bureaucratic domination, not because of some devious manipulative plot, but simply because that is the way the system has been allowed to develop. (1980, p. 29)

She quotes Anthony Wedgewood Benn:

> One relationship which has received far less public attention than its importance justifies is the balance of power between Ministers and senior permanent government officials. . . . By the control of information--the flow of necessary information to a Minister on a certain subject can be made selective, in other ways restricted, delayed until it is too late, or stopped altogether. (1980, pp. 29-30)

She also quotes Henry Kissinger's book The Whitehouse Years, in which he says, "Cabinet members are soon overwhelmed by the insistent demands of running their departments" (MacDonald,1980, p. 30). Kissinger notes that senior civil servants are

> intelligent, competent, loyal and hardworking. But on the reverse side of their dedication is the conviction that a lifetime of service and study has given them insights that transcend the untrained and shallow-rooted views of political appointees. (MacDonald, 1980, p. 30)

MacDonald also quotes Crossman, who writes:

> In general I have found profound resistance in the civil service to a Minister who brings in outside advisers and experts, and profound resistance to interference by anybody with direct access to the Minister. What they like is sole ministerial responsibility because they are convinced that under this system the amount of outside influence exerted is minimal. (1980, p. 30)

MacDonald adds her own reflections to the discussion by noting, "One of my constant frustrations was to find ways in which to penetrate senior management levels so as

to tap this wellspring of fresh ideas, creativity and provocative questioning" (1980, p. 30). Referring to techniques used to "entrap her," MacDonald cites the need to make corridor decisions, unnecessarily long and numerous memos, late delivery of her submissions to Cabinet, and one-dimensional opinions. She voices her concern about the proliferation of senior management coordinating committees to provide advice to ministers and believes that it will "seriously impair the decision-making role of ministers" (1980, p. 31).

MacDonald ends her article with this statement:

> Regrettably, too few Canadian ministers have followed the example . . . of providing a first hand account of the relationship between the minister and the bureaucracy. Regrettably as well, academics in this country have not paid as much attention as they should to the interface between ministers and the senior echelons of their departments. The effective management of that relationship is what distinguishes parliamentary government from bureaucratic management. (1980, p. 31)

Mitchell Sharp, a former Canadian civil servant between 1942 and 1958 and a federal minister from 1963 to 1976, replied to MacDonald's article by painting a substantially different picture of the relationship between ministers and senior mandarins. He believes that senior civil servants have a great deal of power, not because of their clandestine activities but because they are "professionals who have been selected for proven administrative ability and who devote their full time to government" (1982, p. 476). He admits that, at times, they may have greater influence than ministers, particularly weak ones, but he does not see this as "anti-democratic." In his words, "Government is a specialized affair which cannot be run successfully by amateurs without professional advice and professional execution" (1982, p. 476). He suggests that the answer to the question of whether civil servants have too much influence depends, to a large extent, on the way in which individual ministers handle the system and react to advice. He ends his reply to MacDonald by saying,

> A first class non-partisan public service dedicated to the public interest is one of the bulwarks of parliamentary government. It enables the elected amateurs, gifted or otherwise, to make the political decisions and govern the country. (1982, p. 478)

The principle of ministerial responsibility is interwoven in this debate as well. Hodgetts (1985b), says that

> the principle not only establishes a bridge across which most of the traffic between Parliament and the public service is routed but, applied collectively to the Cabinet, it ensures unity of purpose and a coordination of direction at the top. Parliament benefits by being able to home in on one identifiable target, the public servant benefits because he does not have to debate publicly any challenge of his political overlords.(1985b, p. 93)

He adds that, though there is much to commend the doctrine, its modern application to a large bureaucracy of civil servants "poses an impossible burden on the minister," forcing him into "a managing rather than directing role" (Hodgetts, 1985b, p. 93). While this may be the case at the federal level, provincial experience seems to be different. A former Cabinet minister in Alberta, in discussing the topic of delegation of duties to the deputy minister, put it this way:

> Ministers most of the time dealt with policy, not with administration. I told my deputy to run the department; if he didn't do it right, I'd tell him. Ministers who see themselves as skilled administrators probably have problems. Civil servants have a great deal more control in the federal government than in the provincial government. In the provincial government the minister can go and talk to and advise their deputies more easily because they are all so close to each other. (Leitch, 1987)

Johnson (1985) adds another element to the equation by noting that delegation of authority is not a one way street:

> What was delegated today may be withdrawn tomorrow--not by the deputy, but by the minister. Policy may have been interpreted a certain way for five years, but if that interpretation is called into question by a citizen or an interest group, the minister is bound to review it. (1985, p. 292)

Matheson (1985) notes that two theories about the relationship between Cabinet or ministers and civil servants are extant in Canada.

> One theory states that policy making is the sole prerogative of the Cabinet, and it is the responsibility of the civil service to administer policy once it has been determined. . . . The second, and possibly more popular, theory is that our society has become increasingly subject to administrative control, and the real initiative in policy formation has tended to pass from the hands of politicians to those of the civil servants. (1985, p. 266)

This trend upsets writers like Johnson (1985, p. 294) whose opinion is that a civil servant does not have "the right to compete with the minister in his role of testing, sensing, reacting to public opinion." Rather, the role of the deputy in relation to policy should be "to make an effort to adapt the ideal solutions to the practical difficulties his minister faces" (Johnson, 1985, p. 298).

However, Matheson (1985), might counter that the reality is that:

> the enormous expansion in the number and complexity of the tasks taken on by the government inevitably makes politicians even more dependent on the expertise of the civil service, as well as greatly complicating the decision-making process. (1985, p. 279)

In exploring the Department of Education dimension, one runs headlong into the debates over the doctrine of ministerial responsibility and the convention of political neutrality of the deputy minister and other civil servants. These debates emphasize that, even though the role of the minister may be neatly described in the formal requirements of

legislation, tradition, informal expectations, and situational factors strongly influence how a minister behaves in the role. Another arena in which this is also true is the public dimension.

PUBLIC DIMENSION

This dimension of the role of the minister of education in Alberta entails involvement by the minister with a wide array of significant others beyond the political and bureaucratic confines of the government, the Legislature, and the Department of Education. Relations with interest or pressure groups (both institutional interest groups and single-issue interest groups), with the general public, and with the media are components of this dimension.

Interest or Pressure Groups

Kernaghan (1985, p. 308) says "Pressure groups (or interest groups) are organizations composed of persons who have joined together to seek their mutual interest by influencing public policy." Influence in this context is a causal relationship. J. H. Nagel (cited by Dahl, 1984, p. 24) defines it as "a relation among actors such that the wants, desires, preferences, or intentions of one or more actors affect the actions, or predispositions to act, of one or more other actors."

Commenting on the specific activities of interest groups, Kernaghan observes (1985, p. 311) that "it is not surprising that their main function is communication with public officials." One of the reasons for this communication according to Kernaghan, is the function of *legitimation.*

> Through consultation with pressure groups whose members will be affected by proposed policies, government officials can assess the probable effects of adopting these policies and can seek support for them. Such consultation gives these policies some legitimacy (1985, p. 311)

In addition to legitimization, Kernaghan (1985, p. 315) notes that

> ministers, like bureaucrats, need contacts with experienced, knowledgable and influential groups not only to assess better the merits and costs of policy proposals but to increase political support for the government as a whole or for their own departments. They also acquire an alternative source of information and advice to the bureaucracy.

All of this interaction between the minister and the organized interest groups is conducted within the framework of established traditional rules. Kernaghan (1985, p. 320) believes that

> Well recognized groups tend to adhere to the "rules of the game". These rules are neither written down nor expressed openly between the parties but they are nonetheless the cornerstones of the traditional relationship between political leaders and institutional interest groups. . . . The most important of these informal rules is that private exchanges of information and opinion are to be kept confidential.

Archer (1985 pp. 39-46) suggests that educational politics in relation to the influence of interest groups can be explained in terms of three types of negotiation: (1) internal initiation, (2) external transaction and (3) political manipulation. For the purposes of her paper , she defined educational politics as follows:

> Attempts (conscious and organized to some degree) to influence the inputs, processes and outputs of education, whether by legislation, pressure group or union action, experimentation, private investment, local transactions, internal innovation or propaganda.

Internal initiation involves change from the inside by educational professionals and is manifest by the 'profession exchanging the expert services it can offer for other kinds of resources which it needs in order to achieve its own goals' (for example, financial resources and legal rights). External transaction involves relations between internal and

external interest groups and consists of the 'exchange of financial resources for educational expert services'. Political manipulation involves all groups that have formal influence over educational policy and utilizes official powers of legal authority and the capacity to impose negative sanctions to gain service. It is the "exchange of power resources for expert services." Here are Archer's (1985, pp. 60-63) conclusions:

> 1. The greater the effectiveness of political manipulation, the more educational change is polity-directed and educational activities are politically controlled. 2. The greater the effectiveness of external transactions, the more educational operations are responsive to other social institutions and the control of change is in the hands of the elites. 3. The greater the effectiveness of internal initiation, the more the profession itself becomes master in its own house.

Robinson, Cree, and Giles (1988), in reporting the experiences of selected ministers of education in British Columbia who held office from 1953 to 1983, found that "in term of lobbying activity, the three most active groups were the British Columbia Teachers' Federation, the British Columbia School Trustees' Association, and the Federation of Independent School Associations" (1988, p. 12). The effect of this kind of pressure group activity means that while ministers may have "highly personalized agenda of objectives that he or she wanted to achieve as minister" (Robinson, Cree, and Giles, 1988, p. 14), they encounter difficulties in "trying to accomplish what they wanted to achieve" (1988, p.18). Education finance was seen as the major issue (1988, p.11) faced by the ministers when dealing with interest groups.

Paltiel (1982, p. 198) claims that

> in the past two decades Canadians have witnessed a sharp increase in the number and activities of interest groups operating at all levels of government. . . . The increasing number of interactions by way of information gathering and dissemination, advice and consultation, together with exchanges of personnel between the private, voluntary, para-public and governmental sectors in the process of priority setting, policy formulation, policy-making and

> implementation, suggests that the nature and role of the Canadian state has undergone a fundamental change.

Paltiel (1982, p. 210) believes that interest groups have usurped the traditional influence of political parties and that they now "threaten the stability and legitimacy of liberal democracy in Canada." This is an extreme view, of course, but it points to the need to examine the relationship between the influence of interest groups and the influence of political party organizations.

General Public

The relationship between the government and the general public in Canada is much like that elsewhere in the Western world.

> Canada combines the British tradition of a strong executive and centralized leadership with a *relative* freedom from mass pressure and popular constraint. (Kernaghan, 1985, p. 323)

Kernaghan (1985, p. 324) maintains that in Canada, as elsewhere, "the public is fragmented into a large variety of organized and unorganized groups and individuals whose opinions on many issues conflict. Public opinion then is a collectivity of individual and group opinions on governmental matters." He suggests that, as a result, "the traditional mechanisms for interaction between government and society, namely the electoral system, political parties, legislators pressure groups and the mass media, permit the public to exercise little direct influence over politicians and bureaucrats" (Kernaghan, 1985, p. 324). Referring to Arnstein's "ladder to citizen participation" Kernaghan (1985, p. 325-326) suggests that it "provides a helpful means of conceptualizing the gradations of citizen participation . . .

> The first and lowest level is labelled *nonparticipation* and includes (1) manipulation by the power structure and (2) therapy for the organization. The second level is described

> as *token participation* and includes (3) communication with the groups, (4) consultation with the groups, and (5) placation of the groups. The third and highest level, that of *real citizen power*, contains the rungs of (6) partnership, (7) delegated power, and (8) citizen control.

"Kernaghan (1985, p. 326) believes that "much of what passes for citizen participation in Canada is, in Arnstein's terms, a form of tokenism."

Mass Media

The relationship of politicians to the mass media, including newspapers, television, radio, magazines and books, has been the subject of much discussion in Canada and other countries. More and more, politicians are seen as being concerned with public relations and presenting a public media image. However, this is too narrow a view. The mass media is much more than a vehicle to promote a good-looking and good-sounding politician.

In one sense, the mass media are the eyes and ears of the public, which cannot be everywhere at once. In the modern world, people want to be up to date on all that is happening, especially in the political arena, and the mass media are usually the first on the scene. According to Almond and Powell (1978, p. 147), the mass media are the most specialized of all structures of communications, "existing primarily for the purpose of communication rather than depending upon it in the course of other activities."

In another sense, the mass media have become the voices of the public as well, expressing public mood and opinion, and telling politicians what "ordinary" Canadians really believe. Obviously, however, reporting objective reality in all its nuances is not possible in a 30-second television clip. As a result, the mass media can also play the role of opinion makers or shapers and agenda setters. Indeed, media and public relations firms have brought about the twentieth century addiction to opinion polls and surveys. Almond and Powell suggest that

> there seems to be good evidence that media attention to particular problems and issues has an impact on public discussion and awareness of these issues--the so-called agenda-setting role of the media. (1978, p. 149)

A third aspect of the relation between ministers and other politicians and the mass media is the notion of popular control. According to Almond and Powell, beyond reporting on things the minister or government does and voicing what the people believe, the mass media, along with interest groups, "is vital in ensuring that the 'will of the people' is continuously communicated to the leaders." Almond and Powell (1977) also suggest that

> without accurate knowledge of the actions of leaders and without an understanding of the relationship between those actions and popular goals, a meaningful articulation of interests and exercise of political influence is impossible. (1977, p. 156)

For a minister of education, the mass media at its simplest level is a tool to deliver information, to find out what the public thinks, and to check on data provided by other sources. At a higher level, the mass media is seen as actually having influential powers, agenda-setting capacities and time determining abilities. However, this area of the relationship between the mass media and politicians is not easy to prove or to elaborate. Black (1982) questions what we really know about this level of the relationship:

> What do we know about the influence of the mass media institution on government decision makers? Almost nothing systematic. We have anecdotal evidence that the press has played roles in resolving issues. We know politicians have taken decisions favoured by strong local newpapers and which it seems they would not have taken in the absence of press activity. We still need to comb the myriad journalists' and politicians' memoirs to see what firm conclusions can reasonably be inferred from them. The task is a large one but the potential pay-off is high. (1982, p. 250)

The public dimension of the minister's responsibilities is one which has a significant tradition attached to it but few, if any, other formally prescribed requirements. However, the informal expectations from the various publics and the behavior of the minister in the public arena, whether in person or through the media, appear from the literature to be important elements of this dimension of the role.

PERSONAL DIMENSION

The personal dimension encompasses the traits, attributes, goals, and objectives that make up the person chosen as minister of education. The most elusive of all the dimensions, it may in fact be the one that has the most impact on the perception of others about what a minister does or is supposed to do. For this reason it has been included as a separate dimension of the role of minister of education in Alberta.

Before an individual is appointed to the position of minister of education, a variety of factors is taken into consideration by the Premier who makes the final selection. Punnett (1977, p. 58-73), in discussing the formation of federal government Cabinets, suggests that, in selecting his team, the Prime Minister of Canada considers the following factors:

> 1. Constitutional and party considerations: a) ministers must be or must become members of the prime minister's party, and b) ministers must be drawn from parliament, whether or not they have had previous experience.
>
> 2. Practical limitations: a) the talent and potential necessary to be a minister, b) the candidates willingness to forego other activities and income, c) obligations of the Prime Minister to those who helped elect him, d) rivalries, e) the extent to which powerful ministers have been inherited from previous administrations, d) the views of private members, e) the views of groups of the electorate.
>
> 3. Representational considerations such as the need for regional, ethnic, religious balance in the Cabinet.
>
> 4. Size of the Cabinet.

Lougheed (1987) suggests that the first and most important factor in choosing a Cabinet is to determine what kind of people you need and then to consider the magnitude of the role of each minister's package, what the portfolios will be, and whether the department will be in the middle of the action or peripheral to the center. In first selecting his ministers in 1971 Lougheed conceded that a lot of luck was involved. His general rule of thumb, however, was that the top ten portfolios were picked entirely on the basis of merit, including such factors as judgment, committment, and special strengths (for example for the treasury portfolio, someone who can say no; for energy, a negotiator; for agriculture, someone who likes to meet with groups). According to Lougheed (1987), after the top 10 are chosen, other factors such as regional representation, the number of women, cities, ethnic mix, and devil's advocates come into play. Lougheed maintains that previous knowledge of the portfolio was not important and in fact was probably a detriment. A former Cabinet colleague, Roy Farran (1987) believes that Lougheed liked the Harvard School of Business principle of having a generalist in charge as the minister and of hiring the specialists as deputy ministers and department staff. These elements of the personal dimension that are looked for by the premier are important as background to the study of the role of the minister.

The personal dimension of the role of minister of education can also be considered from an historical viewpoint. Who has occupied the position of minister of education in Alberta in the past and what attributes did those people have? Are there similarities among those who have held the office? Table 1 lists all the persons who have held the position since the formation of the province in 1905.

Of those cited in Table 1, two who have been the subjects of theses are Rutherford and Aberhart. Marzolf (1961), in his study of A. C. Rutherford, noted that Rutherford was not only the first premier of Alberta but also the province's first provincial treasurer and minister of education. Rutherford held the education portfolio until his resignation as

Table 1

MINISTERS OF EDUCATION IN ALBERTA

Sept. 8, 1905 - June 1, 1910	Alexander Cameron Rutherford
June 1, 1910 - May 4, 1912	Charles Richmond Mitchell
May 4, 1912 - Aug. 26, 1918	John Robert Boyle
Aug. 26, 1918 - Aug. 13, 1921	George Peter Smith
Aug. 13, 1921 - Sept. 3, 1935	Perren Earle Baker
Sept. 3, 1935 - June 1, 1943	William Aberhart
June 1, 1943 - Sept. 12, 1944	Solon Earle Low
Sept. 12, 1944 - Feb. 23, 1948	Ronald Earl Ansley
Feb. 23, 1948 - Sept. 9, 1952	Ivan Casey
Sept. 9, 1952 - July 31, 1964	Anders Olav Aalborg
July 31, 1964 - June 29, 1967	Randolph H. McKinnon
June 29, 1967 - Dec. 12, 1968	Raymond Reierson
Dec. 12, 1968 - Aug. 30, 1971	Robert Curtis Clark
Sept. 10, 1971 - April 3, 1975	**Louis D. Hyndman**
April 3, 1975 - Mar. 23, 1979	**Julian Gregory Josaphat Koziak**
Mar. 23, 1979 - Feb. 6, 1986	**David Thomas King**
Feb. 6, 1986 - May 26, 1986	Patrick Neil Webber
May 26, 1986 - Sept. 7, 1988	Nancy Jean Betkowski
Sept. 7, 1988 -	James Dinning

SOURCES: Alberta Education Library Services, the Provincial Archives, and the *Canadian Parliamentary Guide.*

Premier in 1910, following the scandal over the Alberta and Great Waterways Railway Line. He lost his seat in the Legislature in 1913. .

Rutherford was a lawyer and had been the secretary-treasurer of the Strathcona school district before the establishment of the province. He was a liberal in politics but a conservative in his views on public education. Marzolf (1961) describes Rutherford as having a respect for books; a belief in the importance of higher education; determination in the face of opposition; excellent skills in judging the right time, place, and person for action; and a solid worth of character. Prior to the formation of the province, Rutherford was principally responsible for the formulation of the Liberal party policy on education. He named himself as the minister of education because he could promote the kind of education system he had advocated Marzolf (1961, p. 55). Marzolf (1961) believes that, while Rutherford's most important achievement in education was the foundation and location of the University of Alberta, he was also instrumental in developing a new course of studies for the province, building schools, providing education for the minority groups in Alberta such as the French-speaking Galician community, providing free textbook readers to school children, and establishing the principle that everyone in the province, whether or not they resided within a school district, should contribute through taxation to education.

Oviatt (1971) conducted a master's study in educational foundations entitled "The Papers of William Aberhart as Minister of Education, 1935-1943." It provides another historical and personal perspective for this study. Aberhart, the first Social Credit premier of Alberta, also held the post of minister of education from 1935 until his death in 1943. Aberhart was a high school principal in Calgary and the dean of the Prophetic Bible Institute, which he founded. Oviatt summarized his examination by concluding that "the Minister's papers demonstrate the active concern Aberhart had for the programs his department pursued. . . . William Aberhart and Social Credit were centrally involved in carrying forward these major educational changes [establishment of large school units,

compulsory membership for teachers in the Alberta Teachers' Association, and new curriculum, for example, the enterprise program in social studies]. . . . Aberhart as Minister of Education was particularly active in realizing both of these changes [the formation of large school units and compulsory membership in the ATA]." Oviatt (1971, p. 135) concluded that, while "Aberhart's activity as Minister of Education was not his most significant area of political responsibility, . . . [he] "demonstrated his ability as an administrator, calling upon the officials of the Department to provide the initiative and direction for educational changes."

Everyone who assumes an elected position brings to that position a personal set of values, aspirations, goals and enthusiasm. The position of minister of education is no different. The personal dimension is therefore a significant matter to be explored in studying the role of the minister, particularly in terms of role behavior.

SUMMARY

This chapter has examined the literature concerning the role of the minister of education, specifically with regard to the doctrine of ministerial responsibility which underlies the Canadian notion of responsible government. An interpretive framework was presented as a way of viewing the role in terms of six dimensions: government, Legislature, party, Department of Education, public and personal. The remainder of the chapter explored the literature related to each of these dimensions in turn. This exploration revealed that the dimensions of the role are anchored, to varying degrees, in formally prescribed requirements and Canadian traditions. but also include informal expectations of others that change from dimension to dimension. The chapter concluded by suggesting that the personal attributes of the minister of education may have a significant impact on what they actually do.

The following chapter explains the design of the research used to explore the dimensions of the role and find answers to the specific problems of the study.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter describes the design of this study. It is divided into three sections. The first section discusses the nature and sources of the data in relation to the trustworthiness of the investigation. The second section deals with the collection of data, and the third section explains how data were analyzed.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF DATA

Both documentary and interview data were used in the study. These sources produced more than 400 pages of documents, 109 pages of typed transcript of the tape-recorded interviews, and 50 pages of notes taken by the researcher during and after the interviews.

Documents

A search was initially conducted for any documents relevant to the study, particularly those illuminating the role of minister of education in Alberta or Canada. The results of the preliminary search at the University of Alberta library, the Legislature library, and the office of the minister of education were used to prepare the draft interview guide. Once the ethics committee had approved the study and the three former ministers had agreed to participate, a concentrated search was made for all documents that directly or indirectly touched on the role of minister, regardless of their relevance to education. Special attention was paid to collecting documents from the period 1971 to 1986. The documents gathered in this manner fall into the following categories, which correspond to the specific problems outlined in Chapter I:

1. Those related to the formal prescriptive nature of the role such as the declaration that ministers take at the swearing-in ceremony; Acts, bills and motions of the Legislative Assembly like the *School Act*, the *Department of Education Act* , Department of Education regulations, and the goals of basic education; legal cases where the role of the minister has been mentioned; current and past Alberta Education documents such as the framework for the new School Act and the Annual Reports of the Department; the Constitution Act, 1867 and 1982; papers and notes taken by the researcher in Political Science 421 at the University of Alberta; sections of the *Members' Guide to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta* (June,1986 version); and the series of *Guides to Alberta's Legislature*, published by The Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA).

2. Those related to the informal expectations, such as excerpts from Cabinet guidebooks, the conflict of interest guidelines, remarks in Hansard either by the minister or by others in the Legislature, literature on the doctrine of ministerial responsibility as it applied to Canadian government ministers, personal documents filed by the ministers and others in the Alberta Provincial Archives, files from the Legislature library on each of the primary participants, and copies of news releases from the Premier's office.

3. Those related to role behavior, such as Hansard records of speeches made in the Legislative Assembly , the work of Krawchenko on dialogue on educational issues in the Legislature, newspaper clippings, and speeches of the three primary participants and others that might shed light on the role behavior of a minister.

In addition, notebooks were kept to record other relevant material and meeting dates.

As expected (see limitations section of Chapter I), problems were encountered in accessing unpublished material related to the informal expectations of the Premier, Cabinet, and Caucus of the government. Access was denied to Cabinet guidebooks (except for

portions relating to the structure of committees) and to Department of Education briefing papers. The loss, however, was minimized by the information about the internal workings of government gathered from Political Science 421, a course taken by the researcher at the University of Alberta. The course was taught by E. P. Lougheed, M. Leitch and R. Farran, all of whom were in the Cabinet during the time period under study. Leads and contacts made during this experience helped to identify other non-restricted sources of information such as personal papers filed in the Provincial Archives. In addition, early in the data collection phase. the researcher contacted the then minister of education for Alberta, N. J. Betkowski, and her executive assistant, D. Osbaldeston, who provided valuable information on the current structure and responsibilities of the government committees and operation. These contacts minimized the access to information limitation and provided a way of triangulating data received from the political science course and other sources.

Interviews

The primary participants interviewed for this study were the ministers of education for Alberta who held office from September 10, 1971, to February 6, 1986:

L. D. Hyndman, September 10, 1971 - April 3, 1975

J. G. J. Koziak, April 3, 1975 - March 23, 1979

D. T. King, March 23, 1979 - February 6, 1986

As a first step in preparing for the interviews, the researcher gathered background information on the three primary participants to assist him in approaching the individuals, conducting the interviews and in understanding the perceptions they offered of past events. The researcher also recalled his previous contact with the three primary participants to identify any possible sources of bias or prejudice that he might have in relation to the people, issues or activities under investigation. In addition, the researcher reported highlights of his background in education and government to his advisor Dr. W. H.

Worth. These were included in the study proposal that was submitted for scrutiny to the ethics committee of the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta. Finally, a summary of the results of this exercise are reported here so that the reader may better gauge the trustworthiness of the data presented in the findings.

Louis Davis Hyndman QC

Lou Hyndman was born in Edmonton on July 1, 1935. He attended Glenora, Oliver, and Westglen public schools in Edmonton and earned his bachelor of arts degree in history from the University of Alberta in 1956. He received his law degree in 1959 and was in general practice with the firm of Field and Field from 1960 until 1971. He served as executive assistant to the Honourable Richard Bell, federal minister of citizenship and immigration in the Diefenbaker government. He married Mary Maclennan in 1962; they have three children Jennifer, Bruce, and Peter.

Lou Hyndman was first elected to the Legislature in 1967 as one of the "six", who, with E. P. Lougheed, formed the official opposition. From 1967 to 1971, he was the education critic and opposition party whip for the Progessive Conservatives. He was reelected in 1971 and was named the first minister of education and Government House Leader in the Lougheed government. As such he served on the Priorities Committee.

Hyndman was reelected in 1975 and named minister of federal and intergovernmental affairs. He also continued as Government House Leader. In 1979, he was again reelected and became provincial treasurer, a post he held through the next election in 1982. He announced his retirement from provincial politics on January 13, 1986 and did not contest the election held in May of that year.

Hyndman is currently a senior partner of the law firm of Field & Field in Edmonton, practising public, corporate, and consumer law. He is on the board of directors of Canada Trust, Husky Oil and TransAlta Utilities. He teaches occasional courses at the University of Alberta on public administration and is on the governing council of the

Institute of Chartered Accountants. He was the chairman of the University of Alberta Project Leadership annual fund campaign for 1987, and was named in spring, 1988 as the chairman of the Premier's Commission on Future Health Care for Albertans.

Julian Gregory Josaphat Koziak

Julian Koziak was born on September 16, 1940, and was raised at St. Michael in the Lamont area northeast of Edmonton. He earned his bachelor of arts degree in 1962 and was granted his law degree from the University of Alberta in 1963. From 1964 to 1975, he was a partner in a law firm and specialized in real estate and corporate law. He was, and continues to be a high profile member of the Ukrainian community in Edmonton and surrounding areas. He married Barbara Lee Melnychuk. They have five children: Leanne, Donald, Deborah, Susan, and Julian.

Koziak was first elected to the Provincial Legislature in 1971 and served as chairman of the Legislative Committee on foreign investment. Reelected in 1975, Koziak was appointed minister of education. He was reelected in 1979 and assumed the portfolio of minister of consumer and corporate affairs. Again reelected in 1982, he was appointed as the minister of municipal affairs.

In 1985, upon the retirement of E. P. Lougheed, he was a candidate for the Progressive Conservative Party leadership, a position won by Don Getty, the current Premier of the province. Following the leadership convention, Julian Koziak continued in his municipal affairs post until the spring of 1986, when he lost his seat in the constituency of Edmonton Strathcona.

During 1987, Mr. Koziak was, for a while, a talk show host on a radio station in St. Albert, Alberta. Currently in business, he is also, in his words, the "Innkeeper" of Le Chateau Louis Motor Inn in Edmonton, which his wife manages.

David Thomas King

David King was born in Perth, Ontario, on June 22, 1946. His father was a United Church minister. He attended public schools in Lethbridge and Edmonton, and the University of Victoria from1964 to 1965, and the University of Alberta from 1965 to 67 and from1969 to 70. He received his bachelor of arts degree in political science and history from the University of Alberta in 1984.

From 1967 to 1969, he served as research assistant to the leader of the Alberta opposition, E. P. Lougheed. In 1968, he married Clare, a teacher. They have two children, Troy and Jason. From 1969 to 1971, he served as research director for the Edmonton and District Council of Churches.

In 1971, David King was elected to the Legislative Assembly and served on the Legislative Committees on *The Communal Property Act*, workers' compensation, and rules of the Legislature. He was reelected in 1975. During the fall and winter of 1975/76 he served as the national campaign coordinator for Joe Clark's federal Progressive Conservative Party leadership campaign. In 1976 he became an associate with the business firm of Capwest Capital Services Ltd of Edmonton. Reelected in 1979, he was appointed minister of education, a post he held through the 1982 election until 1986. In February of 1986, he was appointed minister of technology, research and telecommunications by Premier Don Getty. In May of 1986 he lost his seat in the Edmonton constituency of Highlands.

King is currently in private business in Edmonton with his former executive assistant, Rich Vivone, in a company called Effective Strategies Incorporated. The company offers consulting services on strategic development and government relations in Alberta.

Other participants

To obtain background information, other people were interviewed, including the Honorable N. J. Betkowski, current minister of education for Alberta, D. Osbaldeston, executive assistant to the minister, D. J. Flower, coordinator of communications for The ATA and Dr. C. Hyman, coordinator of teacher welfare for the ATA. The information in Chapter IV Context, was reviewed by Dr. G. R. Thomas, executive assistant with the ATA; and E. P. Lougheed, former Premier of Alberta.

The researcher

The researcher has been keenly involved in education in Alberta for 18 years as a teacher, professional development consultant for the ATA, school trustee, town councillor and an employee of the ATA, from which organization he was on educational leave at the University of Alberta during 1987. He was brought up in a social democratic environment as both his parents were active in the Canadian Commonwealth Federation (CCF) and later in the New Democratic Party(NDP). On expiration of his leave, the researcher resumed his employment as staff assistant with the ATA. On April 22, 1988 he was appointed executive assistant in professional development with that organization.

Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines established by the University of Alberta. Because the primary participants were all still highly visible in the Alberta community, particular steps were taken to ensure that the results of the study would not harm or threaten the participants. These steps are detailed in the data collection section which follows.

The researcher conducted all the interviews personally. The participants were advised of the name of the researcher's advisor whom they were asked to contact in the event of any concerns or complaints. A copy of the final study was offered to each participants.

Trustworthiness

How the data were collected, and analyzed is described in the sections that follow. However, before discussing the actual process of sorting and sifting the data to determine the elements relevant to the study, the whole area of trustworthiness needs to be addressed. Should one question the accuracy of the data as a true representation of reality? Are there factors at play in determining the relevance or salience of particular information? Is the nature of the data affected by the researcher? Will the criteria and framework for selection affect, and in turn, be affected by, the perception of the people providing the information and the person collecting it? The answer to these questions is clearly yes.

Johnson (1987, p. 206), in his work and review of the literature on the power of perceptions, suggests that "through their influence on attitudes and behavior, perceptions are central to both practice and research in education". Relying on Shaver's definition of perception as "the understanding of the world that you construct from data obtained through your senses", Johnson (1987, p. 207) offers seven generalizations about perception that serve as a "basis for examining means to limit the potential prejudicial impact of perceptions on educational research" (1987, p. 206):

> 1. The perception process comprises a number of stages: stimulus, sensation, comparison with an implicit theory of personality and existing perceptual knowledge, attribution of cause for personal behavior, and impression formation/amendment.
>
> 2. Perceptions, rather than objective reality, at least partially shape individual attitudes and behavior.
>
> 3. Perceptions are frequently no more than approximations of reality.
>
> 4. Individuals are incapable of recognizing and verbalizing some perceptions.
>
> 5. Perceptions tend to develop as internally consistent and temporally stable structures.
>
> 6. Perceptions are affected substantially by an extensive but recurring array of factors arising out of social and cultural

experiences, organizational attributes, and personality characteristics.

7. Additional factors, such as first and recent impressions, impose on perceptions of persons (1987, p. 218).

Johnson emphasizes that researchers need to be aware that "perceptions gained from selected informants afford only partial views of the reality perceived by participants" (1987, p. 219), and that perceptions affect how researchers themselves view the data, including such things as what they decide to collect and use and how they collect and use it. "Also critical for the quality of research is the inescapable influence of every researcher's perception upon the process of data collection, analysis and interpretation, as well as subsequent reporting of the results" (Johnson, 1987, p. 220). Johnson believes that these influences show up in the design and wording of questionnaires, the construction of interview schedules, the selection of participants, and the organization, arrangement, and reporting of findings (1987, p. 221).

If one were to stop here in considering the power of perception as it relates to the trustworthiness of data and design, the researcher would surely abandon any further attempts at research and quietly return to his first love, gardening, without hesitation. Luckily, Johnson offers some stategies for overcoming or minimizing the negative effects of perception. He suggests that perceptions can be made more trustworthy if the researcher, first, is "conversant with and watchful for the factors that impose heavily upon informant's perceptions and, thus, upon the quality of the data acquired", and, second, employs stategies for "enhancing and establishing the trustworthiness of perceptual data" (1987, p. 221). For the researcher, such strategies must include "introspection, frank appraisal and disclosure of their own research orientations, methodological biases and inherent prejudices relating to the persons, organizations, and issues associated with each research effort" (1987, p. 221). To do this, the researcher needs to a) consider the "influences of first impressions and personal preconceptions and assumptions"; b) "reflect

critically on, acknowledge and, as far as possible, accommodate opposing conceptions of reality"; c) "select and employ methodological techniques most suited to the research problems"; d) "consciously and, as 'objectively' as possible, subject to personal review all personal beliefs, prior conceptions, and other known biases that relate to the educational issues under investigation . . . and expose them to "public scrutiny in the final report " (Johnson, 1987, pp. 221-222). A third approach to increasing trustworthiness, according to Johnson, can be found elsewhere in the research literature and includes such strategies as establishing credibility/internal validity, transferability/external validity, dependability/reliability and confirmability/objectivity (1987, pp. 222-223).

Johnson's cautions and suggestions are particularly relevant to this study because it deals with an area of education governance not previously explored to any degree in the literature and because the limited number of primary participants are highly visible in the Alberta community. As a result, throughout the next sections dealing with the selection process, documents, interview methodology, and the data analysis, special efforts have been made to address the matter of trustworthiness and to acknowledge and minimize the negative effects of perception.

COLLECTION OF DATA

Most data for this study came from interviews conducted with each of the three former ministers. Because the collection of documents relevant to the role of minister has already been addressed, this section will concentrate on the interview methodology employed.

Pre-Interview Activities

Preliminary contact with Lou Hyndman was made in the late spring of 1987 by Dr. S. C. T. Clarke on the researcher's behalf. Mr. Hyndman appeared, from this contact, to be favourably disposed to participate. The researcher and Julian Koziak have both belonged to the Kappa Sigma fraternity since their university days and, in June 1988, the

researcher discussed the project with Koziak who agreed to be involved. No preliminary contact was made with David King.

The first formal contact with the primary participants was by telephone. The researcher explained the purpose of the research, solicited the participants' approval to include them in the study and asked them to participate in the interviews. Permission was sought in advance to use a tape-recorder during the interviews. The participants were allowed to give fully informed and voluntary consent regarding their involvement in the research and were told that they could opt out of the study at any time. Furthermore, they were given assurance that the study was being conducted in order to add to the knowledge on educational governance and was not intended to harm them as individuals. All three participants agreed to participate in the study and to be interviewed and tape-recorded. A tentative interview schedule was discussed.

Follow-up letters (see Appendix 1) were prepared. The letter explained that the study was being conducted as partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of master of education in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta. The participants were advised that the purpose of the study was to illuminate the role of the minister of education and that it would describe the perceptions of three incumbents about the formal requirements and informal expectations of the position and how they translated these into action within a particular social-educational context. They were assured that the study was being conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines established by the University of Alberta.

The letter, along with a copy of the interview guide and a summary of the thesis proposal (see Appendix 2), were personally delivered to the participants' offices two weeks before the first interviews were scheduled to take place. The researcher took the opportunity to acquaint himself with the surroundings in which the interviews would be conducted. It was also an opportunity to formally meet Lou Hyndman for the first time. The other two participants were not available when the letters were delivered, but the

researcher had already been personally acquainted with both; with David King, during meetings between representatives of the ATA and the minister during his term, and with Julian Koziak when he was minister of municipal affairs and the researcher was a member of the Fort Saskatchewan town council.

Interview Guide

The interview guide (Appendix 2) was developed on the basis of the data collected from the preliminary document search. The guide began by asking some general questions, the answers to which were used as a source of information for the context chapter and to supplement sections of the findings not covered elsewhere. The next sections of the guide related to the initial set of five dimensions of the role of minister of education. The final part, entitled "Other", dealt with aspects of the minister's tenure that were eventually formed the basis of data for the sixth, personal dimension of the role. The guide used semi-structured and open-ended questions to ensure that the information collected could be used to verify the documented descriptions of the role, to allow the participants to describe aspects of the role not defined in the literature, and to allow the participants to describe how they met the requirements of the role of minister of education.

Interviews

In addition to the overriding problems with perception as described earlier, another major limitation of this type of research is, what Borg and Gall (1983, pp. 437-439) describe as, "biasing of data obtained from the interview." Steps had to be taken to reduce the "response effect" (difference between the answers given or reported and the true answers). The response effect results from the predisposition of the respondent, the predisposition of the interviewer, and the procedures used in conducting the study. The literature suggests that these can be substantially overcome by careful planning and interviewer training. According to Measor (1985), other ways of increasing the credibility and dependability of the interview data, include, building a sound relationship with the

interviewees, developing trust, acceptance, and rapport and being critically aware of what the respondents are saying.

As a first step in minimizing these problems, the researcher conducted all the interviews personally. He had conducted practice interviews as part of a study with school trustees for Educational Administration 532. While collecting data during a program evaluation in a school district in central Alberta for Educational Administration 515/516, the researcher was also able to practice his interviewing skills. A draft of the interview guide was submitted as part of the requirements for Educational Administration 512 and critiqued by members of the class. Advice given by the researcher's advisor, W. H. Worth, regarding the form of the questions to be asked and the time needed to complete the interviews was very useful. Discussions with S.C.T Clarke in educational psychology about interviewing were also most helpful regarding the use of this technique.

The researcher interviewed each of the three former ministers twice for approximately 1 1/4 and 1 1/2 hours each time. These interviews took place between September 28 and October 23, 1987. Each of them was tape-recorded. Notes were taken during the interviews in case the recording equipment failed. Field notes were also made to record problems encountered with the interview guide, to note issues that needed to be addressed at subsequent interviews, and to record references suggested to the researcher by the participants. In addition to these major sessions, a telephone interview was conducted with Mr. King in mid February, 1988 to complete a number of questions concerning the party dimension which were not covered in the initial interviews.

For the main sessions, Hyndman and King were interviewed in their offices. Koziak was interviewed in a corner of the dining room of Le Chateau Louis Motor Hotel. Although the researcher was at first concerned that this location would result in technical problems and interruptions, it turned out to be comfortable for both Mr Koziak and the researcher. Because no problems were encountered in taperecording the first session, the second interview was also held in the dining room.

Post-Interview Activities

Because of the nature of the study and the fact that the three former ministers are very visible in the Alberta community, protecting their anonymity was not possible. For this reason, the three participants were offered the opportunity to review the report of the findings prior to the final preparation of the thesis. They were told that changes they deemed necessary would be made by mutual consent with the researcher. In addition to the above procedure and to further ensure that the results of the study would not harm or threaten the participants, each was promised that, if they were quoted, or if unpublished material of theirs was used in the study, their permission would be sought.

In accordance with this agreement, information gained from the interviews which was used in the study was sent to each participant in June,1987 with a covering letter (Appendix 1) requesting them to return their comments by July 22. Replies were received from all three and their comments and corrections were included in final editing of the findings.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data from the documentary material and the interviews were analyzed from the perspective of the integration of political and administrative theory as described in Chapter I, and within the interpretive framework of the six role dimensions developed in Chapter II. This section presents the results of that analysis.

Documentary Material

The documentary material was analyzed in terms of the six role dimensions: government, Legislature, party, Department of Education, public, and personal. Data collected for each dimension were initially sorted according to these time periods: pre-1971, 1971-75, 1975-79, 1979-86. During this process, the documents were scrutinized in terms of content, authenticity and proximity.

Content analysis, which occurred simultaneously as the documents were being collected, involved determining their worth, relevance, and accuracy with respect to the record, and checking the credibility and competence of the author. Care was taken to ensure the authenticity of the documents with regard to date, authorship, origin, and originality. Proximity involved checking the material to ensure that it related to the period during which the three ministers held office.

Documentary material that related to context was gleaned, combined with contextual data from the interviews and reported in Chapter IV. The remainder of the documents describing the role of minister of education in Alberta were then separated into the three categories of formal prescription, informal expectations, and role behavior and used as background material for the interview data presented in Chapter V.

Interview Data

The notes taken during and after the interviews and the transcriptions of the tape-recordings were sorted by role dimension, using the interview guide as the organizing framework. Answers to questions in the guide regarding the context within which the three ministers held office were used to supplement and cross-check the documentary data already collected.

A comparative analysis of the participants' comments relating to the six dimensions was made to highlight common elements. The results of this analysis appear as propositions in the findings in Chapter V. Finally, the propositions were used as the basis for a composite description of the role of minister of education in Alberta, reported as the conclusion of the study in Chapter VI.

Both the documents and the interview data were examined using an inductive data analysis approach suggested by such writers as Guba and Lincoln (1982), Wolcott (1985), and Owens (1982). This meant that not all variables could be determined for certain in advance but were allowed to emerge from the data. This approach introduces

inevitable subjectivity and perceptive selectivity because the researcher analyzes, orders and interprets all the data. However, as Lincoln and Guba point out, the process of data analysis is

> essentially a synthetic one, in which the constructions that have emerged from (been shaped by) inquirer-source interaction are reconstructed into meaningful wholes. Data analysis is thus not a matter of data reduction, as is frequently claimed, but of induction. (1985, p. 333)

Triangulation or the cross-checking of information collected with the other sources "so as to verify them, to check the accuracy of information, and to test the perceptions of different actors to given events" (Owens,1982, pp. 14-15) was also used to validate data, to reduce subjectivity and to limit the negative effects of perception.

SUMMARY

This chapter has detailed the nature and sources of data used in the study and has emphasized the ethical considerations and the trustworthiness of the research. The process of data collection was examined, especially the principal methodology of interviewing. The chapter ended with an explanation of how the data were analyzed within the study's interpretive framework.

CHAPTER IV

CONTEXT

This chapter begins with a brief historical review of the characteristics of the political-legislative, social-economic, and educational milieu in Alberta which have relevance to the role of provincial minister of education. A similar format is used in the rest of the chapter to describe the salient features of the context within which the ministers of education in this study held office.

Information for the chapter, derived from public records of the province and Canada, included historical accounts, *Alberta Hansard*, annual reports of Alberta Education, the work of Hansen (1985), and Statistics Canada, and other information from the Legislative Library and the Alberta Provincial Archives. These data were supplemented by news clippings, recollections of the researcher, and contributions by the three participants during the interviews. Once the information was compiled by the researcher, the chapter was reviewed by others who were participants or observers of the Alberta scene during the period from 1971 to 1986. Their suggestions and comments were most helpful in preparing the final draft submitted to the researcher's thesis committee.

It is hoped that this background will be useful in interpreting the role of minister of education in Alberta.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE, 1867 TO 1971

Since the study focused on the role of the minister of education during the time from September, 1971, to February, 1986, this chapter necessarily concentrates on those years. However, to put the data concerning that period in perspective, significant events in Canada and Alberta that led up to the fall of 1971 will be discussed first.

Political-Legislative Context

In the British North America Act of 1867, responsibility for education in the Northwest Territories region of Canada, which included the areas now known as Saskatchewan, Alberta, the Yukon, and the North West Territories, fell under the terms and conditions of Section 93, which stipulated, "In and for each province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education." At the time, the region was controlled by the Hudson's Bay Company, but, in 1875, authority for these areas was transferred to a governor and a five-person council by the passage of the North West Territories Act. In 1884, the council adopted the first school ordinance establishing a dual Roman Catholic and Protestant system, similar to that in Manitoba and Quebec. An ordinance of 1892 transferred control of education to the Assembly of the North West Territories.

At the same time, battles were being fought in the Canadian Parliament for the establishment of separate provinces for the area. Although the agitation for autonomy had begun over transfer of taxation to the territorial government to accommodate the flow of immigrants to the West, much of the debate did not centre on economic matters but on the provision of the guarantee of education rights for the minorities in the region, particularly, those who were Roman Catholic. In 1890, the Manitoba government under Premier Thomas Greenway, had abolished public funding for Catholic schools, and minority education rights became a national issue. Indeed, the shaky Conservative government of Charles Tupper was toppled in 1896 by Wilfred Laurier and the Liberals, much as the result of the Manitoba Schools Question. The matter of the educational rights of Manitoba's Catholic minority resulted in a further four-week parliamentary crisis for the federal Liberal government but the storm was eventually quelled in late 1896. The signing of the Laurier-Greenway compromise did not restore separate schools, but provided in legislation some religious instruction guarantees which consequentially, applied to the territories.

In passing the Alberta Act in 1905, the Candian Parliament, in section 17, maintained Section 93 of the British North America Act as the basis of education governance in the new province, with the additional provisions from the Northwest Territories Ordinance of 1901 to ensure that nothing in any laws pertaining to education should *prejudicially affect* any right or privilege of separate schools that any class of persons have at the date of passage of the Act.

A.C. Rutherford, the leader of the Liberal party, was called on to form the government of the new province and he became the first Premier of the province and its first minister of education. In the November, 1905 election, the Liberals won 23 of the 25 seats, and the Conservatives won two. The first Legislative Assembly met in 1906. The Liberals governed Alberta until 1921.

Chalmers (1967, p. 42) suggests that

> Politically, the first decade of Alberta's history as a province was relatively tranquil. Its first government . . . bore a Liberal label, but for the first five years at least the provincial Liberal movement was almost non-partisan, following the trend of the governments of the North West Territories which had preceded it. Official opposition in the Legislative Assembly was virtually nil, and its two Conservative members found nothing to criticize in the government's objectives, but only in its methods of attaining them.

Times would not continue so peacefully in the second decade of the Liberal reign, and, with the "severe agrarian discontent following the First World War" (Engelmann, 1987) the United Farmers of Alberta, under H. Greenfield swept the Liberals out of office and formed the government from 1921 to 1935. With respect to education legislation during these early years, distinctly Albertan statutes slowly replaced the adopted North West Territories ordinances. Examples included the Department of Education Regulations of 1906; the Act to Grant Certain Powers to the Minister of Education of 1908, which was amended in 1914; amendments to the school ordinances in 1910; the School Grants Act of

1913; the Tax Recovery Act, the School Assessment Act and the School Attendance Act of 1922, the new School Acts of 1922 and 1931 and the new Department of Education Act of 1922, which was amended several times up to 1935.

The devastating effects of the great depression and the popularity of W. Aberhart and his fundamentalist religious radio programs led to the Social Credit Party becoming the government in 1935. It stayed in power until 1971.

Education remained a high priority with W. Aberhart, a high school principal from Calgary, assuming the position of minister of education as well as Premier. Significant education legislation during this period included a new School Act and Department of Education Act in 1955 and another new School Act in 1970.

In March of 1965 a new political force emerged on the Alberta scene with the selection of E. P. Lougheed as leader of the Progressive Conservatives. Starting with a Party that had no seats in the Legislature and had managed only 12.5 percent of the 1963 popular vote, E. P. Lougheed led a group of six members into the Legislature in 1967, becoming the official opposition in Alberta until the summer of 1971.

From 1905 to 1971, education had a high political and legislative priority in the province, and the portfolio of minister of education was high profile in the governments of the day. In 1905, Alberta's first Premier, A. C. Rutherford, was the minister of education. In 1935, W. Aberhart also took on the education portfolio while Premier.

Initially, various duties of the minister of education were adapted from those established for the commissioner of the North West Territories. Since 1922, the two primary pieces of legislation setting down the legislative powers of the minister have been the Department of Education Act and the School Act . The specific sections of those acts that relate to the role of minister of education are dealt with in Chapter V.

Social-Economic Context

In 1901, the population of the area comprising Alberta was 73,000. In 1911, the year of the first provincial census, the population had risen to 374,000. As the region began its new life as a province, the population was primarily rural and the economy principally agricultural, with a good measure of hunting and trapping. From 1905 to 1971, the economic base shifted from agricultural to oil and gas.

Oil was found in Turner Valley, south of Calgary, before World War I. The first big find, however, came only in 1947, in Leduc, south of Edmonton. The discovery of oil was a significant factor in lifting Alberta's population above the 800,000 level and increasing the province's urbanization. Until the Second Word War about 70 percent of the population was rural. By 1971, only 50 percent of the 1,628,000 residents lived in rural areas (Engelmann, 1987 and Statistics Canada).

As an economic indicator, total government expenditures in 1905 were about $1 million, $170,000 of which went to education. Between the two wars, total provincial government expenditure hovered between $25 and $50 million and in 1950 it passed $100 million. In 1971, government expenditure topped the $1 billion mark, with government grants to education representing $210 million of the total.

While the province was expanding and urbanizing, one characteristic of Alberta did not change. From the beginning, close to one half of the population has been of "third Canadian origin", neither British nor French (Engelmann,1987), and for most of the years during this period the majority of the population was born outside the province. This has resulted in Alberta assuming a very multicultural nature.

Educational Context

The first schools in the province were founded by Catholic and Protestant missionaries in the mid-19th century. The North West Territories ordinances of the late 1800s established a dual confessional system, but this duality was gradually weakened by commissioner Haultain. On September 1, 1905, when Alberta entered confederation, the

new province inherited an educational organization structure based on the Ontario model of one provincial education system with legistated provision for the dissenting religious minorities. One year later, in the first annual report of the new Department of Education, the Deputy Minister, D. S. MacKenzie, said:

> For some time after the Alberta Act came into effect considerable attention was necessarily devoted to the organization of the department; but by adopting in the main many of the regulations and administrative precedents established by the Territorial Department of Education, the new deparment was able to avoid any serious interruption in its work in the transition from territorial to provincial institutions. (Alberta Department of Education, annual report, 1907)

In 1906, the first full year of operation for schools in the new province, the total revenue of school boards was $1,395,540.49. Legislative grants paid to schools totalled $170,315.16. Total expenditures of the 570 school districts having classrooms in operation amounted to $1,259,106.62. The entire teacher salary bill for the districts was $386,107.99, one tenth of which was still owed to teachers at the end of the year. The average annual salary of the 924 predominantly female teachers who taught the province's 28,784 students that year was $614.13, an increase of $14.84 from 1905.

By 1971, total revenue of school boards was $370.08 million, with the province contributing $210.59 million. Total expenditures of the 1,376 operating school boards totalled $369.81 million. The average teacher salary was $10,548. The number of pupils had risen by 15 fold and stood at 425,500. The year1971 was a period of extremely rapid growth for the province. The urban population was beginning to shift to the suburbs, overall enrollment was increasing, and the demand for new schools and increased funding were high. It was generally a good time for education, the money was available to allow continuous expansion, and the attitude of the government and the general community in Alberta was favorable to education.

Several other significant educational events which occurred in Alberta before 1971 have implications for this study of the role of minister of education. The first was the development of teacher education. In 1908, the Alberta Normal School was opened in Calgary as a training centre for teachers. It was supported and watched over by the first minister, Rutherford. In 1939, under Aberhart, the Normal Schools, (renamed Schools of Education) were given college status. Subsequently, teacher education was moved to the University of Alberta, the institution that Rutherford helped found. Since then, teacher education has expanded to the other two provincial universities in Calgary and Lethbridge as well as to the provincial college system, which offers the first two years of the program in some localities. Facilities and programs for teacher education were a significant part of the duties of the minister of education until 1972, when the responsibility was assumed by the separate ministry of advanced education. The minister of education retained the authority to license teachers and to regulate teaching standards in the province, a matter that resulted in considerable debate during the term of one of the primary participants in this study, D. King.

The second event that significantly affected the role of the minister was the formation of the Alberta Teachers' Alliance in 1918. In 1934, the Alliance, was renamed The Alberta Teachers' Association. In 1935, the Social Credit government of the day, under Aberhart, enacted the Teaching Profession Act which ensured automatic membership in the Association for every public and separate school teacher in the province. In 1939, the Teachers' Superannuation Act was passed, establishing for the first time a pension scheme for teachers. This development of the teachers' association, coupled with the existence since the early1920s of the Alberta School Trustees Association, created the two major interest groups in the province with which subsequent ministers would have to deal.

The third event of significance to the role of minister of education occurred in 1970 when a revised School Act was proclaimed, providing for locally appointed superintendents. This decentralization of the authority for education from the provincial

government to local school boards, along with the necessary support services in the form of regional offices, marked a significant watershed in the governance of the province's education system, changing the relationship of the minister to school boards.

SEPTEMBER 1971 TO APRIL 1975, HYNDMAN

Having briefly explored the period leading up to the election of the Progressive Conservatives in 1971, the following sections present the key contextual characteristics of the years in office of the three primary participants in the study: L. D. Hyndman, J. G. J. Koziak, and D. T. King. The first period discussed is September 10, 1971, to April 3, 1975.

Political-Legislative Context

On August 30, 1971, the rejuvenated, urban-based Progressive Conservative Party under E. P. Lougheed won 49 of the 75 constituencies and swept all the seats in Edmonton, to form the first Conservative government in Alberta's history. In comparison, the essentially rural-based Social Credit Party, which had ruled the province for 36 years, retained only 25 seats. R. C. Clark, who had been the minister of education since December 12, 1968, became the Social Credit opposition House leader and education critic. The New Democratic Party took the other seat in the Legislative Assembly.

The new government was sworn in on September 10, 1971. L. D. Hyndman, one of the original six Conservative opposition members in 1967 and a chief lieutenant of the Premier, became the minister of education, government House leader, and a member of the Priorities and Planning Committee. Within the ranks of the 49 elected Conservatives, two private members were elected who would later become ministers of education, Koziak in 1975 and King in 1979.

In announcing the largest Cabinet in Alberta's history, Premier Lougheed said:

> Although the Cabinet is larger than in the past, we believe that necessary coordination can be effectively achieved by a

> Cabinet-committee structure. There will be six Cabinet Committees--Finance; Priorities and Coordination; Economic Planning; Social Planning; Rural Development; Education; and Metropolitan Affairs. (Lougheed, 1971b)

One of the reasons for the larger Cabinet was the decision to split the responsibility for the areas of basic education and advanced education (post-secondary) between two ministers and consequently two departments. The government's rationale for doing so was recorded in the press release announcing the new Cabinet on September 10,1971:

> The purpose of splitting the Department of Education into two parts is to make this largest spending department more manageable by a Cabinet policy-maker and to assure that cost and quality control measures in both cases are receiving much greater attention by a minister. There is also a need for greater coordination in the post-secondary education field and we believe this division improves the possibility for such a result. (Lougheed, 1971b)

The Legislative Assembly was not convened until March 2,1972, giving the new Cabinet time to organize. When the Assembly opened, the reasons for splitting the education portfolio were elaborated in the throne speech:

> My government has made a number of major changes in organization to improve the effectiveness of its operations, in accordance with contemporary demands. Legislative ratification for these changes will be requested. These changes include:
>
> . . . A new Department of Advanced Education, responsible for all educational programs in vocational and technical institutions, colleges and universities. The division of the former Department of Education into two distinct portfolios reflects my government's concern that adequate ministerial attention be given to all educational activities in the province and full recognition be given to the diverse elements comprising these various educational activities. A Standing Committee of the Executive Council consisting of the Ministers of Education, Advanced Education, and Manpower and Labour has been created to assure effective coordination. (Government of Alberta, March 2, 1972).

Other announcements in the 1972 throne speech dealing with education included an increased emphasis on equal opportunity for children with handicaps and learning disabilities (including funding and facilities) and a review of laws governing professions and occupations.

On March 14, 1972, the new minister of education, Lou Hyndman, introduced Bill 19, the Department of Education Amendment Act. He told the Assembly that, in addition to splitting the activities of education and advanced education, "the bill will delete and reduce the powers and prerogatives of the Minister of Education to appoint temporary and part-time staff." (Hyndman, 1972)

Subsequent speeches from the throne, on the dates indicated in 1973, 1974, and 1975, identified the following government priorities:

• *February 15, 1973:* Implementation of education policies, with the dual goals of providing equal opportunities and creating a high quality learning environment; reduction of the burden on property taxpayers for education and social services through the Alberta Property Tax Reduction Plan; and establishment of new and longer-term (three-year) education finance plans for basic and post-secondary education facilities.

• *March 7, 1974:* Removal of the provincial education property tax for home owners and farmers; expansion of the early childhood services program; support for the first time to handicapped children aged 3.5 to 4.5; provision of a special grant for small, remote rural schools to preserve community schools in smaller centers; stimulation of voter interest in school trustee elections; and implementation of new approaches in modular school designs to accommodate expanding and contracting enrollments resulting from the shifts in population.

• *January 23, 1975:* Implementation of initiatives to improve even further the quality of education including; an increased role for parents in the curriculum decision-making process; decentralization of curriculum development throughout the province; development

of new provincial bench mark exams to measure student achievement; improvements to school libraries; additional efforts to equalize educational opportunity in rural areas by providing extra basic funding and special grants for areas facing declining enrollments and school closures; implementation of the first phases of a long-term education finance plan; expanded emphasis on consumer education, environmental education and Canadian content; and increased support for all categories of handicapped children.

Early in the Spring 1975 sitting of the Legislative Assembly, the government called a provincial election for March 26.

Social-Economic Context

Between 1971 and 1975, the population of the province increased by 9.2 percent, from 1,627,900 to 1,778,300. In comparison with that of the previous five years, much of this rise was the result of interprovincial migration, which doubled to 60,000 during this period. Most people migrated to the two largest cities of Calgary and Edmonton and their surrounding communities, and the urban/rural ratio edged upward from 73:27 in 1971 to over 75:25 by 1975. With the announcement of the Syncrude tar sands project, the area around Fort McMurray in northern Alberta began to attract newcomers, as well.

The oil and natural gas industry began to dominate the economy as world oil prices soared, and the government took full advantage by significantly increasing royalty rates. With this new-found wealth, Alberta began to prosper. Unemployment dropped, and, from 1971 to 1975, the Gross Domestic Product (the value of all goods and services produced in the province) rose from $7.84 billion to $18.6 billion. Its annual growth rate in 1971 had been 13.0 percent but by 1975 had risen to 19.4 percent. The boom was beginning.

Most of the prosperity was concentrated in the cities. The rural areas were still hampered by large distances between population centres, inadequate transportation corridors, and a general lack of government attention to economic development. This

inattention of the previous Social Credit government was an issue that the opposition Conservative members had heard while campaigning in 1971. As a result, many of the new government's initiatives during its first term in office concentrated on promoting economic activity and government services in the outlying regions of the province and containing the growth of the large cities. The development of central Alberta around Red Deer was encouraged, and government agencies were relocated to Ponoka, Camrose, Vegreville, and Athabasca. In addition, plans were begun to provide natural gas service to all rural areas in the province.

The rising affluence brought with it problems as well. Inflation, which had hovered under five percent during the '60s and early '70s, went to double digits in 1974 and 1975. While consumers had more disposable income, the prices of products and housing began to rise as well. Families found it tougher to cope in this environment. For the period 1971 to 1975, the annual divorce rate was 262.9 per 100,000 population, representing an increase of 62 percent over the previous five years and a level 49 percent higher that the Canadian average. The negative effects of the boom were being felt.

Educational Context

In 1971, the number of operating schools in the province was 1,376; total pupil enrollment was 425,500. The total expenditure on education by school boards was $369.8 million, yielding a per pupil expenditure on education of $869.13. This had risen from the 1960/61 average of $348.24. The proportion of the total school board revenue from the province stood at 56.9 percent. In terms of other government expenditures, education represented 17.23 percent of the total provincial budget in 1971/72. The average salary of the 22,255 teachers was $10,548.

The separation of the education and advanced education portfolios (including the subsequent reorganization of the two departments), and the release of the report of the Commission on Educational Planning, were probably the two most significant events of the

beginning of Hyndman's term as minister of education. T. C. Byrne had retired in May of 1971 as deputy minister of education to become the president of Athabasca University. He was succeeded by R. E. Rees. With the split of the departments in the fall of 1971, E. K. Hawkesworth became deputy minister of education, and Rees went to advanced education. Five branches of the old department continued to serve both sections for a period of time. These included research and development, finance, statistics and legislation, communications, personnel, and the school book branch.

At almost the same time, the Commission for Educational Planning was finalizing a report entitled "A Choice of Futures, A Future of Choices", which was released by the Conservative government in 1972. Public discussion began and the report came under careful study and scrutiny by all sectors of the educational community, including teachers, trustees, parents, and the Legislature. Of significance to the role of the minister of education, the report called for greater separation of the governing and coordinating functions "in order that local units of government and individual institutions can develop the vital capacity of self renewal" (Province of Alberta, 1972, p. 123). The Worth Commission called for increased planning and suggested that "the lead roles in provincial planning are taken by the members of the Legislature and the Cabinet who establish Alberta's broad social, economic, and educational goals and priorities" (1972, p. 230). Shying away from prescriptive recommendations, the commmissioners offered their preferences for education in the '70s and '80s, which they said had been influenced by two factors, " the need for equity and the need for momentum" (1972, p. 299). These words appeared later in government throne speeches and the speeches of the minister in the Legislature . The *top ten* preferences of the commission were:

- provision of universal opportunity and selective experience in early education;
- abolition of Grade XII departmental examinations;
- inauguration of the Alberta Academy [a multi-media, personalized, flexible, modular, non-institutional, all-terrain vehicle for the provision of recurrent, life-long learning],

> Early Education and supporting ACCESS [educational communications] network;
> • extension of opportunities in further education;
> • modification in certification requirements for teachers in early and basic education;
> • reorganization of the Department of Education and Department of Advanced Education;
> • revision of funding arrangements for all levels of recurrent education, including provisions for life experience and student assistance;
> • modification of the school year and of procedures for the transfer of credits;
> • reduction in the length of all general and most professional first-degree programs in universities;
> • preparation of an Integrated Provincial Development Plan. (1972, p. 300)

The report ended by noting that "if we believe that trend is not destiny, there is still time for us to have a choice of futures and a future of choices. And the future is where we shall live our lives" (1972, p. 301).

In recalling his perceptions of the educational climate when he assumed the role of minister of education, L. D. Hyndman made the following observations:

> There was a good education system in place and our job was to expand that system to ensure a contemporary education for children moving into the next decade. The fall of 1971 was an interesting time because the Worth Commission study was about to be presented. There was a mood for change in the air as a result of that report and the various hearings that lead up to it. I thought that there was a need for a more intense and high-level debate about issues in education. There was a public expectation that there were going to be changes as a result of the report. A stimulus was required to focus education, and I deliberately went out to "shake the tree" a bit. We had to start discussing the nature of education and learning.

With the report to debate and a minister who was prepared to discuss changes, 1972 saw the beginning of a process in which most educational programs and services were to be evaluated and reconsidered. This process would escalate and continue well into the mid-eighties. Studies were initiated or completed on school finance, school administration, school buildings, early childhood education, educational television, instruction and certification of teachers, program budgeting, modification of the school

year, development of Canadian studies and materials, transportation, intercultural education, Hutterite education, and education of foreign students. During the year, the organization and staffing of the regional offices were completed.

In 1973, with the reorganization of the department under way, the focus of attention shifted to preschool and elementary education with the formation of the early childhood services branch and the establishment of the educational opportunity fund for grades 1 to 6. In addition, plans began for establishing the Alberta Educational Communications Corporation (ACCESS), Grade 12 departmental examinations were abolished, and the new School Foundation Program Fund, based on per-pupil grants instead of classroom grants, was under discussion.

From 1974 until the spring of 1975, assessment and review were the catch phrases. Policies on private schools were under review as were the curriculum development process and the operation of the regional offices of education. The minister's Advisory Committee on School Finance was operating, and its recommendations, such as the equalization grant plan, were pending. It was a time of affluence, and because the government was in the last 18 months of its term, other programs were announced such as expanding the early childhood services branch to develop programs and services for preschool children and establishing a building-quality restoration program to upgrade Alberta schools. As the March, 1974 election approached, the Heritage Savings Trust Fund was announced--a development that would considerably affect the preparation of curriculum and learning materials during the next five years.

APRIL 1975 TO MARCH 1979, KOZIAK

This section highlights the relevant features of the political-legislative, social-economic and educational context in which J. G. J. Koziak was minister of education. His term of office was from April 3, 1975, to March 23, 1979.

Political - Legislative Context

On March 26,1975, a provincial general election was held. The Conservative Party was returned to office with a 62.6 percent popular vote and an even greater majority. The Conservatives campaigned on the issue of Alberta's need to be strong to deal effectively with Ottawa and to take its "rightful" place in Canada's economy. The Conservatives took 69 seats; the Social Credit Party was reduced to four and its leader lost his seat. W. G. Notley of the New Democratic Party held his constituency of Spirit River-Fairview, and a lone independent was elected.

When the new executive committee was announced on April 3, 1975, E. P. Lougheed had reshuffled his Cabinet , a tactic he was to repeat after each election during his term as Premier. Julian Koziak was named as new minister of education, and L. D. Hyndman became provincial treasurer.

In the throne speech on May 15 at the opening of the first session of the 18th Legislature , the government said it first priority in education would be to improve basic education and increase support for services for the handicapped. One of the improvements in education the government had in mind was to increase the emphasis on Canadian history and geography, a pet interest of the Premier. On May 16, Koziak announced in the Legislative Assembly that the *Great Canadian Content Machine*, Alberta's travelling display of Canadian resources, was "parked on the grounds of the Legislature building." The display, he said, would travel to Alberta communities to "make teachers and adults more aware of the importance of Canada, both in the past and the present" (Hansard, May 16, 1975).

Other education matters that received attention in the Legislature during the new minister's first year in office included an amendment to the Teachers' Retirement Fund Act to permit private school teachers to enter the fund, school finance, assistance to rural schools, Ukrainian education, pupil-teacher ratios, the educational opportunity fund, transportation, classroom discipline, controversial issues in the classroom, the Northland

School Division (Swift) report, the School Act, the Worth Commission, length of the school year, and the inauguration of the Alberta Educational Communications Authority(ACCESS).

An examination of the throne speeches and Hansard reveals the following government priorities and legislative activities pertaining to education which occurred during the rest of this period:

• *March 4,1976:* Improvement in education curricula; consolidation and paring of outdated services to improve delivery of programs in all areas, with a view to exercising restraint to control inflation without losing economic momentum; continuation of the educational opportunities fund; the provision of additional support for severely handicapped children; restructure of the curriculum policies board to stimulate new thinking with regard to the courses of study in basic education; improvements in the quality and delivery of education services to northern and remote communities (including amendments to the Northland School Division Act), introduction of more basic skills testing, consideration that the Legislative Assembly might establish goals of basic education for the province, and approval of amendments to the Department of Education Act to define private schools.

During the interviews for this study, Julian Koziak commented on the events which led up to the new definitions of private schools:

> The Linden Mennonite case went to court during my term, and, because it challenged the new Alberta Bill of Rights, we were ready for the decision. Before it came down, I had already been through Cabinet with the regulations for category 4 private schools, just in case. As a result, when the ruling was in favor of the Mennonites, allowing them to educate their own children, we were able to resolve the issue within weeks of the court case by putting in place regulations to legitimize category 4 private schools. These schools did not have certificated teachers and received no funding. For the other categories of private schools which were teaching the Alberta curriculum and employing certificated teachers, the plan was to gradually increase funding to the 80 percent level.

> We did not consider appealing the Linden decision because we had originated the Individual Rights Protection Act and the Alberta Bill of Rights. To have a major test of our legislation followed by an appeal would seem like persecution.

• *February 24, 1977:* Consideration of the desirability of greater emphasis on the acquisition of basic knowledge and skills; encouragement of public discussion of education; scrutiny of levels of student achievement and the place of provincial examinations; assistance to students in disadvantaged areas of the province under the Educational Opportunity Fund; selective expansion of special education services; policy changes and increased support for urban and rural libraries; announcement of $8.4 million from the Heritage Trust Fund for a learning resources project to produce Canadian material; agreement by the Legislature to have the goals of education assessed and priorized; and introduction of legislative changes to allow corporations to assign taxes on the basis of religious affiliation.

• *March 2, 1978:* Adoption by the Legislature of the Statement of Goals of Basic Education for Alberta (a first for the province), which distinguished between goals of education and goals of schooling. During the interviews, former minister Koziak commented on this development:

> The goals statement came about because of criticism that schools were not doing the job they were supposed to do by law or according to the expectations of parents and the public. There was also the feeling that education should not be the exclusive domain of professional educators. It was a sign that the public wanted to have control of education. There seemed to be a need for the province to provide the political direction for education. This led to the discussions in the Legislature about the goals of education to ensure that the needs of the average student were looked after and that education did not take place exclusively in schools or that parents could just drop their kids off at school and everything would be looked after. Educators were seen as having a role to play, but it was to be a partnership of everyone in the community, with the schools playing the primary role. The goals statement by the Legislature

provided a skeleton for implementing education in the province.

Other government priorities in 1978 included the examination of the organization of schooling in the province; clearer identification and updating of course concepts to be taught; introduction of achievement testing emphasizing Canadian content; examination of school building requirements; expansion of support for French instruction programs, initiation of the Education North project; increased curriculum development for handicapped children; continuation of the Heritage Trust Fund learning resources project; establishment of public sector salary guidelines in response to the federal government's "6 and 5" anti-inflation program; and the tabling of a white paper on the organization of professions and occupations (Chichak report).

In February, 1979, the Heritage Trust Fund was already a great success, the government had just purchased Pacific Western Airlines, and Albertans were enjoying their new-found wealth as never before. At the federal level, the Trudeau government was threatening to implement the national energy program, which would limit the price of oil in Canada. The Prime Minister was also suggesting that he might move unilaterally to repatriate the constitution. With good times at home and a federal government to fight with over the ownership of energy resources, the time was ripe for a provincial election. Premier Lougheed called one for March 14, 1979.

Social-Economic Context

When the Conservatives were reelected in 1975, they immediately increased the royalty rates on oil and gas production to 30 percent. These rates would eventually go even higher and generate billions of dollars of revenue for the province. The royalties, at their height, yielded nearly 50 percent of the provinces total revenue. A significant portion of this wealth went into the Heritage Trust Fund, a fact which began to irk central Canada as major business interests moved west.

Between 1975 and 1979, the population, now over 75 percent urban, rose from 1,778,300 to 2,055, 000, an increase of 15.5 percent. Alberta was the fastest-growing province in Canada. Much of the increase was due to immigration and interprovincial migration. Even with this influx of people from other parts of Canada, the unemployment rate in Alberta was the lowest in Canada, dropping from 4.1 percent in 1975, rising to 4.7 percent in 1978, then dropping to 3.9 percent in 1979.

Between 1975 and 1979, the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) rose from $18.6 billion to $34.4 billion. By 1979, its annual rate of growth was 24 percent. This growth of the GDP was primarily the result of industrial expansion and construction tied, almost exclusively, to the oil industry. Exploration and development of oil and natural gas were at record levels, take-home pay was the highest in Canada, and tax rates were the lowest. Construction was booming in housing, new hospitals, roads, rural recreation facilities, and schools, all of which were in short supply. The total retail trade, as one sector of the GDP index, also remained high, but its rate of increase began to slow by the end of the period dropping marginally from 21.9 percent in 1975 to 18.5 percent in 1979. The boom was in full swing and the province was setting the economic pace for the rest of the country.

• However, along with the good times, came increased social problems such as alcohol and drug abuse, suicide, crime, and family breakdown. From 1976 to 1980, Alberta's annual divorce rate was 23 percent higher than in the previous five years. It stood at 324.1 per 100,000, 32 percent above the Canadian average. Also on the downside of all this affluence were high prices, spiralling interest rates and housing shortages. Even though inflation began to level off by 1979, it remained high. Having gone over 10 percent in 1975, inflation was still above 7 percent in 1979. Sociologists and economist began to wonder how long this activity could be sustained without serious repercussions. They did not have long to wait.

Educational Context

In 1975, the number of operating schools in the province was 1,300. Total pupil enrollment was 421,800, a decrease of 3,700 students from 1971. The total expenditure on education by school boards was $611.89 million, up 65.5 percent from 1971, yielding a per-pupil expenditure on education of $1450.67, up 66.9 percent from 1971. The proportion of the total school board revenue from the province stood at 70.07 percent, up from 56.9 percent in 1971. In relation to other government expenditures in 1975/76, education represented 16.91 percent of the provincial budget. The number of teachers now totalled 22,814, an increase from 22,255 in 1971. The average teacher salary in 1975 was $16,544, up from $10,548 in 1971. As an indication of the boom economy, the budget increases for education were 15 percent in 1975, 11 percent in 1976, 10 percent (plus additional funds for small schools) in 1977, and 8 percent in 1978.

Notwithstanding the educational programs already cited as priority by the government during this period, there was a great deal of other activity in the education community. In 1976, the Downey report on social studies was released, recommending increased Canadian content. In July, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) visited Canada and reviewed education in Alberta. The Curriculum Policies Board replaced the elementary and secondary boards with 13 of 16 members chosen by the minister, who added more public members. The province withdrew its Unemployment Insurance Commission grant, and school boards had to pick up the extra $4 million in payments. At the same time, the Hanson report on education funding was released, showing school boards carrying large surpluses. The Minister's Advisory Committee on Student Achievement (MACOSA) was established, discussion of second language instruction was burgeoning, the goals of education were debated around the province, and energy conservation projects in schools were being studied in earnest. In his 1976 year-end address, the Premier hinted at the reintroduction of departmental examinations.

In 1977, the provincial budget provided for 100 new special education teaching positions in the province. In May, a school discipline study was released, revealing that 46 percent of the population thought discipline was too lenient. The Woods-Gordon report was released proposing alternative use of schools, especially after hours and during summer months. At the same time, the concept of community schools was being discussed. On the curriculum front, a report was tabled calling for more physical and health education. Achievement tests in physics, English, and mathematics were developed and administered as part of the recommendations of MACOSA. Standardized testing was back in vogue. A discussion paper entitled "Alberta Education and Diploma Requirements" was released and received major discussion and criticism around the province. In the fall, a 13-week extended practicum was made mandatory for teacher education, and the requirement for initial certification of teachers in the province was raised to four years of teacher education including a degree.

By 1978, revisions to curriculum were under way, including changes to elementary language arts and mathematics, an expanded French bilingual program, and the inauguration of studies on how best to deliver other second language programs. These studies, plus pressure from the community, led to the establishment of the language services branch of the Department of Education to coordinate school programs involving languages other than English. The 1978 budget provided funding for 120 new special education positions, gave a 36 percent increase in special grants to rural schools, increased assistance to small schools, gave more grants to areas with declining enrollment, and provided funds to expand rural school bussing. School building regulations were relaxed to allow boards to decide where and when to build new facilities. Provincial funding for new construction would be on a new sliding scale based on enrollment.

Between late 1978 and early 1979, guidelines for evaluating student achievement were formulated, and heated debates ensued around the province. A revised social studies

program was announced for all grades, which included 50 percent Canadian content and increased emphasis on history, geography, government, and culture.

During the interviews, J. G. J. Koziak recalled his perceptions of the social and educational climate in the province while he was minister:

> It was a period of extremely rapid growth for the province. The population was shifting to the suburbs and creating the donut effect around the major cities. Enrollment was increasing, but the bigger problem was the demands for new schools in new subdivisions at the same time that enrolment was declining in the inner city areas. Revenue was increasing, and the demands and expectations for school construction and general funding for schools were high. There was an expectation that schools could do everything, even those things that the community and other agencies should be doing, like services to children with disabilities or handicaps, The schools were thought to have all the answers to these problems. These expectations were there when I became minister and did not abate during my term.

MARCH 1979 TO FEBRUARY 1986, KING

This section presents the significant characteristics of the period from March 23, 1979 to February 6, 1986 during which David T. King was minister of education in Alberta.

Political - Legislative Context

On March 14, 1979, after months of tense negotiations between Alberta and the federal government over oil and gas royalties and export taxes on natural gas, the people of Alberta went back to the polls in a provincial election. The Conservatives won 74 of the 79 seats, the Social Credit Party held four seats, and the New Democrats held one. When the Cabinet was announced on March 23, D. T. King was named the new minister of education and J. G. J. Koziak was moved to the municipal affairs portfolio.

For the first three and a half years that King was in Cabinet , the battle over energy rights heated up, talks on repatriation of the constitution began and western separatism found roots in the bible belt. In early 1982, Gordon Kessler, of the Western Canada

Concept Party, won a provincial by-election in Olds-Didsbury. At times between the spring and the fall of 1982, polls indicated that up to 25 percent of Albertans were in favor of western autonomy. Viewing the threat as real, Premier Lougheed went on the offensive, believing it was better to tap the sentiment against central Canada's control than to fight it. Speaking to the P. C Party convention in the spring of 1982 about his battles with Ottawa, Lougheed said:

> We then faced a federal government, a centralist government, that wanted to change this country--change it in a way that we never contemplated--to centralize all the decision-making. Well, they tried it on the constitution and we stopped them cold. They tried it on energy and we moved them from the living room to the porch--I am beginning to think that we ought to move them off the property. (Wood, 1985, p. 194)

On November 2, 1982, with the separatists active in the province, Lougheed went back to the people of Alberta for another mandate to speak for westerners and Alberta. He succeeded, and the only separatist independent member in the previous Assembly was defeated. The Conservatives took 75 seats. W. G. Notley was returned for the NDP, along with a colleague this time, R. Martin. Two Social Credit members, R. Speaker and W. Buck, were also returned but their ties to the Social Credit movement had all but disappeared. Speaker and Buck soon moved to form the new Representative Party, and jockeyed with the New Democrats for the title of official opposition, which eventually went to the New Democrats for the first time in the party's history in the province.

D. T. King returned to the Cabinet as minister of education. He remained in that portfolio through the Conservative leadership convention in the summer of 1985 (during which Lougheed stepped down as Premier), and into the new administration of Premier D. Getty until the following spring.

In terms of government intentions, as set out in the throne speeches during King's term, education retained its high profile. On May 24, 1979, at the opening of the 19th

Legislature, the government announced special programs to commemorate the United Nations' Year of the Child. These programs included expansion of the learning disability fund, full implementation of the school Building Quality Restoration Program (BQRP), improvement in services at the Alberta School for the Deaf, and more assistance for dependent handicapped and multi-handicapped children including a facility for deaf and blind children. A junior high school component of the educational opportunity fund was promised, including programs aimed at improving attendance and reducing drop-out rates. The small school (under 1,500 students) jurisdiction grants were extended, the high school achievement test program was continued, and attention was directed to the desirability of a regular program of testing basic literacy and computational skills prior to high school graduation. In the throne speech, the government also promised to continue program reviews, to table the reports of MACOSA, and to publish materials produced under the Heritage Learning Resources Project.

A review of government priorities for education as announced in subsequent throne speeches during the rest of Mr. King's term reveals a great deal of activity and many sources of controversy:

• *March 20,1980:* Establishment of the groundwork for education in the '80s; implementation of a five-year project to increase the number of programs for teachers of handicapped children, a review of the Teaching Profession Act as it related to government policy governing future legislation for the professions and occupations; instigation of a major review of education finance; encouragement of the community school concept; continued support for special education; commencement of teacher exchanges;and continuation of student exchanges with Quebec.

• *April 2, 1981:* Implementation of the new social studies curriculum designed to improve awareness and understanding of Canadian history, geography and government at the secondary level; provision of new services for the deaf; provision of more special education

positions and a diagnostic program of handicapped children during the International Year of Disabled Persons; renewal and expansion of the EOF project; initiation of stage two of the education finance review in a search for alternate ways to fund education; and completion of a thorough review of the operations of the Northland School Division.

- *March 4, 1982:* Initiation of a process for completely reviewing the School Act, a review of the role of private schools; presentation of the report of the education finance task force; implementation of the student evaluation program, including provision for achievement tests and comprehensive examinations; exploration of the concept of challenge exams; completion of the successful social studies teacher inservice project; and continued emphasis on revising curriculum to emphasize the history and geography of Alberta and Canada. (In 1982, the Constitution Act was passed by Parliament. This legislation, particularly the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, would come to have a significant impact on education in the province).
- *March 10, 1983:* Consideration of making comprehensive examinations mandatory for all students seeking a high school diploma, to ensure comparable high standards for students graduating from high school; encouragement for the increased use of microcomputers in schools; provision of good computer-operated course material and inservice learning activities for teachers using computers in the classroom; and consideration of reports from the Department of Education task forces on the computers in schools and the education of gifted and talented students.
- *March 15, 1984:* In-depth reevaluation of the appropriateness of the School Act; reevaluation of the adequacy of junior and senior high programs to prepare young people for a more competitive and challenging world market place; implementation of the grade 12 diploma exams; introduction of new approaches to teacher evaluation and the review of the professional conduct of teachers; provision of specific funding for special education students, including the gifted and talented; institution of the Native Education Project; and

establishment of the Consultative Committee on Tolerance and Understanding as a result of the "Keegstra affair."

• *March 14, 1985:* Presentation of a policy statement outlining programs to improve secondary education to prepare graduates for the job market of the '80s; preparation of new policies following the initial review of the School Act; release of the recommendations of the Consultative Committee on Tolerance and Understanding; consideration of activities related to the professional development of teachers, including a possible new Commission of Alberta Teachers to establish and maintain standards for, and conditions of, teacher certification and discipline; development of policy, programs and materials resulting from the Native Education Project; and inauguration of a province wide tour on the School Act discussion paper, *Partners in Education.*

On February 6, 1986, Premier Getty reshuffled his Cabinet and D. T. King went to the new portfolio of technology, research, and telecommunications. P. N. Webber took over as the minister of education.

Social-Economic Context

Between 1979 and 1984, the population of Alberta rose from 2,055, 000 to 2,349,000, an increase of 14 percent. While the rate of interprovincial migration and immigration decreased over this period, a change was also occurring in the origin of the new residents. Of the immigrants to Alberta in 1980, 33.3 percent were from Europe and 48 percent were from Asia. By 1984, only 18.9 percent were from Europe and 53.7 percent were from Asia. From 1981 to 1986, most immigrants settled in Calgary (42.2 percent) or Edmonton (39.6 percent), continuing Alberta's urbanization which rose from 77.2 percent in 1981 to nearly 79 percent by 1986. According to the 1981 census, the ethnic origins of Albertans were 49.6 percent British, 12 percent German, 7 percent Ukrainian, 5.8 percent French, 4 percent Schandinavian, 3.4 percent Dutch, 3.1 percent

native, 1.9 percent Polish and 13.2 percent other. English was claimed as the mother tongue by 80.9 percent, French by 2.8 percent and "other" by 16.3 percent.

The Gross Domestic Product between 1979 and 1985 rose from $34.4 billion to $62.0 billion, the annual rate of growth being 24 percent in 1979 and 7.3 percent in 1985. The boom that began in the previous five years continued in the early part of this period but subsided in 1980/81 as OPEC began to cut oil production and created a world oil shortage. As people lined up at the gas pumps, energy conservation was the catch phrase of the day. To further compound Alberta's woes during this time, the federal government instituted the national energy program in 1980, restricting the provinces from raising their oil prices to the world level. Federal restrictions were also imposed on natural gas exports, a matter which Alberta took to court. The province won the appeal, and a settlement was eventually worked out between the two levels of government in the fall of 1981. But it was not a sweet victory for Alberta. OPEC lowered its price of crude and flooded the market with cheap oil. As the world price plummetted from over $40 a barrel to $10, exploration rigs moved out of Alberta to greener pastures in the United States.

The boom was over. Interest rates soared again, and by late 1981 the province and the country were in recession. Office buildings in Calgary stood empty, food banks sprang up across the province and the unemployment rate, which had been the lowest in Canada in 1979 at 3.9 percent, jumped to 10.7 percent by 1983. In the same period the retail trade growth rate dropped from 18.5 percent to 3.3 percent as consumers began to save whatever money they had left after inflation. In 1983/84, the situation began to level off and by 1986 a slight recovery began to take shape.

Educational Context

In 1979, the number of operating schools in the province was 1,423, with a total pupil enrollment of 415,600, a decrease of 6,200 students from 1975. This figure began to rebound by 1983/84 with 1473 operating schools reporting 422,764 students. In 1979, the

total expenditure on education by school boards was $957.8 million (up 56.5 percent from 1975), yielding a per-pupil expenditure on education of $2304.50 (up 58.9 percent from 1975). By 1983/84, expenditures by school boards would rise to $1891.56 million, with per pupil expenditures increasing to $4,496.95. The proportion of the total school board revenue received from the province stood at 61.33 percent, down from 70.07 percent in 1975. By 1983/84 this further declined to 55.80 percent. In relation to other government expenditures in 1979/80, education represented 14.61 percent of the total provincial budget and by 1985/86 it was 12.26 percent.

The number of teachers in 1979 totalled 24,037, an increase from 22,814 in 1975. By 1983/84 the numbers had increased to 27,982. The average teacher salary in 1979 was $24,108; in 1983/84 it was 37,059, up from $16,544 in 1975.

During the interviews for this study, King was asked for his perceptions of the educational climate when he took office.

> Things were very quiet. The late '60s and early '70s were good for education. Enrollments were increasing and the money was available to allow continued expansion. It is always easier in an expanding economy than in a contracting environment. The educational leadership in the department, the ATA, the ASTA, and the other interest groups was stable. New teaching blood was coming in at the entry levels. Alberta governments and the general community of Alberta were favourable to education. People could compare education in Alberta with that in other places and find themselves lucky. There were wants and needs for more, and generally the resources were available.

As the pace of change in education increased, things would not remain calm for Mr. King as minister. This was a period marked by controversy, heated debate and crisis.

During 1979 and 1980, the report of MACOSA was published and circulated for reaction throughout the province. Thus began the debate over achievement testing and the return to some form of departmental examinations. In the meantime, the reorganization of the finance, statistics, and legislation branch of the department was completed, gearing up

for yet another round of changes in education finance. By the spring of 1981, the student evaluation branch had been established amid discussions about new policies regarding assessment of schools, school system, teachers, and students. An evaluation of Alberta's students general knowledge and awareness of history, geography, and citizenship, was under way. As a 75th anniversary project, major funding was provided by the government for the production and distribution of Hurtig's *Canadian Encyclopedia*. The Alberta government donated one copy of the encyclopedia to every school in Canada. Along with this renewed interest in Canadian content, came an increased centralization of curriculum decision-making within the Department of Education, as responsibility for the initial approval of curriculum was removed from the duties of the Curriculum Policies Board.

The latter part of 1981 and the spring of 1982 saw increased emphasis on computer technology, the development of a new elementary program of studies, and the funding and implementation of a major social studies inservice project which was well received by teachers across the province. By the end of 1982, a complete reorganization of the Department of Education was underway, including the reshuffling of directors, the decentralization of early childhool services, a review of private schools, and the shifting of approval of work-experience programs to the regional offices. As 1983 approached, debate heated up over the proposal to reinstitute mandatory, subject-based, comprehensive examinations in Grade 12. The debate boiled over in the spring of 1983, resulting in a major confrontation between the minister of education and the ATA. After protracted discussions and consultation, the proposal was revised, and provincial diploma examinations for Grade 12 were implemented. The first of the new exams were written in January 1984.

In the meantime, another problem was brewing, In the spring of 1983, James Keegstra was fired by his Eckville school board in central Alberta for failing to follow the Alberta curriculum. He lost his appeal at the Board of Reference and allegations were made that he was teaching antisemitism. The incident rocked Alberta. In June 1983, a former

Conservative MLA, R. Ghitter, was named to head the Minister's Advisory Committee on Tolerance and Understanding. In the meantime, Keegstra was charged with unprofessional conduct, and the ATA began an investigation. In the fall of 1984, the ATA's Discipline Committee found Keegstra guilty of unprofessional conduct and the ATA removed Keegstra's right to membership in the Association and recommended to the minister that Keegstra's teaching certificate be revoked. Keegstra appealed the ruling and the penalties to the Teaching Profession Appeal Board, but the appeal was denied. In December, 1984, the minister of education cancelled Keegstra's Alberta teaching certificate. He was later charged with, and found guilty under the Canadian Criminal Code of promoting racism and hatred. In 1988, the conviction was reversed on appeal.

While this was going on, new policies were adopted regarding the evaluation of school systems, schools, teachers, students, and programs, and the Management and Finance Plan was initiated to coordinate and control the funding of education in the province. At the end of 1984 and the beginning of 1985, the government focused on student achievement, services to exceptional children (both handicapped and the gifted and talented), and the formation of a project team to meet with native people and develop a new provincial policy for native education.

Having been on tour around the province for a year and a half, the Committee on Tolerance and Understanding released its final report in January, 1985. Many of its recommendations regarding programs to increase tolerance and understanding had been implemented already, but others called for revisions to the Teaching Profession Act and supported the minister's proposal for a Council on Alberta Teaching Standards (COATS). These suggestions generated heated debate between the minister and the ATA, a debate which continued throughout 1985. At the height of the COATS debate, the minister attended a meeting called by the teachers but was not allowed to speak. When the Association's Annual Representative Assembly was held in the spring of 1985, King did not attend. This was the first time that a minister of education did not attend the Assembly.

The issue was not settled until June 1985, when a compromise was reached over the membership of COATS, which allowed the ATA to name its own representative.

While all this was going on, the review of secondary education, begun in 1984, was winding down and, on June 12, 1985, Lougheed and King announced a new policy on secondary school programs. The statement, including eight guiding principles and a framework for secondary education, set the stage for major curriculum changes to be implemented over the next four years. Plans were also in full swing to review the School Act and, in July of 1985, "Partners in Education: Principles for a new School Act" was published as a discussion paper. Debate over the secondary education policy and the new School the Act dominated the remainder of King's term as minister of education.

Notwithstanding the controversial issues and his confrontations with the ATA, King, when interviewed, cited special education as the most important, driving issue during his term.

> Special education was the major issue of the decade. It was an underlying heartbeat for most of what else was going on in education, sometimes at the forefront and sometimes in the background. Several groups developed the notion that every child was special in some way and the whole movement developed on many fronts. Other issues came up and erupted at various times, but the one issue that always allowed me to move on any one of the five priorities I had for education, was special education.

SUMMARY

This chapter outlined the context within which each of the three primary participants held the position of minister of education in Alberta. The chapter began with a brief historical review and then described the three periods during which the ministers held office. For each of these periods, three strands were examined; the political-legislative context, the social-economic context, and the educational context.

The next chapter presents the major findings of this study on the role of minister of education in Alberta.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

This chapter presents the major findings about the role of the minister of education in Alberta. The findings are based primarily on data from the interviews conducted with the three primary participants between September 28 and October 23, 1987. Following a brief introduction, each section reports the responses provided by the participants to the questions posed by the interviewer. The answers to the interview questions are supplemented, wherever possible and appropriate, with references to documentary data collected as part of the study.

The chapter is organized around six dimensions of the role, namely, government, Legislature, party, Department of Education, public, and personal. For each dimension the findings are further categorized in terms of formally prescribed role requirements, informal expectations, and role behavior. A series of propositions at the end of each dimension draws together the significant elements of the role of minister of education in Alberta.

The order and placement of some questions and answers in some dimensions do not correspond exactly to their location in the interview guide. Changes were necessary in order to present the findings in a logical, sequential fashion. Also, new information that came to light after the guide was prepared suggested that certain elements of the role had been incorrectly categorized. This is particularly so in the case of the personal dimension, which was not considered as a separate category until after the guide was prepared.

GOVERNMENT DIMENSION

The government dimension of the role of minister of education includes the incumbents activities as a member of the Cabinet (executive council), Caucus and committees or task forces of these two bodies. This dimension also encompasses the minister's activities as a representative of the government outside the province, such as on the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada. In this dimension, the minister of education is principally associated with the Premier, other Cabinet ministers, other government MLAs and counterparts in other governments.

Formally Prescribed Requirements

As noted in Chapter I, the formally prescribed requirements of a role are those things that a person is or is not supposed to do as set out in statutes and other legal descriptions or as established by tradition. In terms of the government dimension, the minister of education is confronted with such requirements right from the beginning.

Oath of Members of Executive Council

On assuming office, the minister of education swears the Oath of Members of Executive Council:

> You, _____, do solemnly promise and swear that you will serve her Majesty, truly and faithfully in the place of her council in this her Majesty's province of Alberta, you will keep close and secret all such matters as shall be treated, debated and resolved on in executive council, without publishing or disclosing the same or any part therof, by word, writing, or any otherwise to any person out of the same council, but to such only as be of the council, and yet if any matter so propounded, treated and debated in any such executive council shall touch any particular person, sworn of the same council, upon any such matter as shall in any wise concern his loyalty and fidelity to the Queen's Majesty, you will in nowise open the same to him, but keep it secret, as you would from any person, until the Queen Majesty's pleasure be known in that behalf. You will in all things to be moved, treated and debated in any such executive council, faithfully, honestly and truly declare your mind and opinion to the honour and benefit of the Queen's Majesty, and the

> good of her subjects without partiality or exception of persons, in nowise forbearing so to do from any manner of respect, favour, love, need, displeasure, or dread of any person, or persons whatsoever.
>
> In general, you will be vigilant, diligent and circumspect in all your doings touching the Queen Majesty's affairs; all which matters and things you will faithfully observe and keep, as a good councillor ought to do to the utmost of your power, will and discretion. So help you God.

According to tradition, a minister should be a member of the government's Cabinet (although this need not necessarily apply in the case of a coalition government). To formalize this prerequisite, the above oath is administered by the clerk of the Assembly. When a new government is being installed after an election, the ceremony is carried out as soon as possible after the Premier has made the selections and usually several days before the opening of the Legislature.

What formally prescribed requirements were there for the minister of education as a member of the Cabinet?

HYNDMAN Besides the strict legalities required of a member of the Cabinet, the oath gave one the feeling of great responsibility especially since I hadn't had previous experience in government. Beyond the solidarity and confidentiality aspects, there really are no formal requirements set down for a Cabinet minister. There is no book anywhere that says here's what you're supposed to do. That is parliamentary tradition.

KOZIAK There was a formal requirement to attend Cabinet meetings that were called. There was formal structure and timing for the meetings. You were expected to provide the answers about education in Cabinet. There were also formal requirements about which decisions were to be made by executive council. We introduced guidelines on disclosure of personal assets by Cabinet ministers and requirements for ministers to put their assests into a blind trust. The rest is tradition and past practice.

KING As a Cabinet minister, I was to contribute to the general decision-making process of Cabinet, be a party to the decisions about all the portfolios, and see the whole picture, not just education. This is not well understood. Many people think that each minister is quiet

in Cabinet except on those issues directly related to the portfolio for which he is responsible. While contributing on all issues distracts the minister from concentrating on his department, it also benefits the minister by forcing him to be continually aware of the whole community in which education is being provided.

There is also a formal requirement to communicate decisions of Cabinet to the education community whether or not you personally supported them in the Cabinet debate. If you can't support Cabinet decisions in public, then you shouldn't be the minister. The minister is also responsible for the administration of certain pieces of legislation.

The conflict of interest guidelines referred to by Koziak were introduced in the Legislature by Premier Lougheed on May 2, 1973. The statement of public disclosure of interest for Cabinet ministers appears in Appendix 3.

Oath as Minister of Education

In like manner to other ministers of the government, the person named for education also takes an oath as minister of education

> I, _____, do solemnly and sincerely promise and swear that I will duly and faithfully and to the best of my skill and knowledge execute the powers and trusts reposed in me as minister of education, for the province of Alberta. So help me God.

What "powers and trusts" were you being asked to execute?

HYNDMAN From an administrative point of view, I was responsible for all the acts and regulations and for all the portions of them that specifically named the minister. I also felt it meant working as an educational team with the department , the Cabinet, and the Caucus and also with the interest groups such as the trustees, the teachers, and the home and school people. The real test was to try to mirror or sense the feelings of the million and a half Albertans who had opinions about education, and who were in, or were affected by, the education system. It felt a bit awesome, particularly because I did not have a background in education; yet I felt comfortable about the expertise available.

Ministers deal mostly with basic principles with legislation and policy. For the most part, the administration was delegated to the department, and the running of the

schools was delegated to the school boards through the trustees. Constitutionally, it could all have been run out of the minister's office. Things are a bit different for school boards because they have the right to make both good decisions and mistakes, and it is not up to the minister to second guess what they do or how they do it. I did not feel responsible for the individual decisions they made as long as they fit the broad policy.

I believe that, if I had been immersed in education, I could not have been as objective. There were also the formal requirements of the preparation, presentation, and defence of the budget of the department, but none of this was written down formally.

KOZIAK The powers, or formal requirements were set out in the Department of Education Act, the School Act, and to a lesser degree in other legislation. I did not have any powers outside the legislation; even there the discretionary powers are set down in terms of the "minister may" clauses. If the Legislature did not give me the powers, I did not have them.

KING I was: 1. To bring to Cabinet the education policy and program, as well as recommendations regarding statuatory laws and regulations, and recommendations dealing with the appointment of people, all of which were to have a positive effect on education.

2. To make the program, policy, and financial decisions related to education which various pieces of legislation established as the responsibility of the minister rather than the Cabinet as a whole. Ministers make policy decisions and communicate these to the professionals who implement them. But I had to see that they were being implemented.

3. To communicate. I had to inform the public what was to be expected so they could compare this with what actually occurred in their schools. This allows them to come back to the minister and say that the two don't match. They could then ask if the minister had mis-stated his intention when he announced the policy or if something went wrong in the interpretation or implementation of the policy. For this purpose, the minister has to be the focal point of the feedback system.

4. To act as a fail-safe mechanism. It is vitally important that, in law and in public perception, the minister retain ministerial discretion. In retaining it, the minister must accept the responsibility for his actions. Ministerial discretion is absolutely essential so that a policy or implementation scheme is not allowed to wreak havoc on some child or teacher or jurisdiction for whom, uniquely, it does not apply. Ministerial discretion allows exceptions to be made in exceptional circumstances that do not fit neatly into the policy or are counterproductive in that individual case. To be responsive to the squares who don't fit the round holes. The minister would be abrogating his responsibility if he didn't acknowledge the exceptions.

The "powers and trusts" reposed in the minister include the formal obligations (the "shall" requirements) and the discretionary authority (the "may" clauses) as set down in the various Alberta statutes dealing with education. While many statutes come into play from time to time, the two major pieces of legislation governing kindergarten to Grade 12 education in the province are the Department of Education Act and the School Act. As an introduction to these formal responsibilities, the oath taken by each minister of education obligates the individual to execute the authority provided in those acts to the best of their ability. Specific sections of those acts which are relevant are described in the Department of Education dimension.

Informal Expectations

The informal expectations of significant others, such as the Premier, and members of Cabinet and Caucus, form the second part of the requirements for the role of minister of education in the government dimension. The participants were asked about the informal expectations that they perceived to be operative while they were the minister.

In addition to the formal requirements, what did you perceive was expected of the minister of education as a member of the Cabinet?

HYNDMAN I assumed that I was expected to use information and a degree of common sense to implement policies and to try to listen and be sensitive to what people had to say and then respond by carrying out the duties that are set down for the minister in the acts and regulations. As a minister, I was to implement the commitments and policies of the government and bring them forward to Cabinet in a way that they would be practical and tested, after appropriate consultation with the people involved in light of the realities of the budget. I was expected to react and respond to the problems that arose in education. In the area of communications, I was expected to act as the spokesman for the government on education policy and to interpret the education system to my fellow Cabinet members. I was also expected to defend and justify my department's budget during the annual budget meetings in the fall. At times, I also had to ask for special warrants for things that were not in the budget, but which needed funding.

KOZIAK I was expected to answer questions in the Cabinet on education. It was also expected that, when I went to Cabinet with an educational policy, that I had the support of the Social Planning Committee.

KING In addition to what I mentioned in the formal requirements, I was expected to be an advocate for education at the Cabinet table.

The Social Planning Committee referred to by Koziak is a standing committee of Cabinet established to consider social policies of the government. Its members are all from the Cabinet. As with other standing committees, it meets regularly and is funded by the executive council office.

What did you perceive was expected of the minister of education in relation to the Caucus?

HYNDMAN To communicate and explain about the education system to MLAs who had questions and problems in their constituencies concerning education, and to convince Caucus of the wisdom of certain actions and policy. It meant giving Caucus members information so they could answer the questions they received about education.

KOZIAK To answer questions about education, to pilot policy and material dealing with education, and to convince Caucus to support any legislation I was bringing forward on education.

KING To keep MLAs well informed about the status of education, the threats, the weak points, and the opportunities. There was an expectation that the minister would not be overbearing about education; not overload Caucus members (remembering that there are 30 ministers all trying to do the same thing). At the same time you had to get the message across, particularly about priority items, and you needed to be sure that wherever the MLAs were in the province, they were giving the same message. The minister was expected to use the MLAs as information pipelines in both directions. It was also important to involve the MLAs in political development work. They are part of the political leadership of the province and you want to draw them along by giving them a better understanding of the

education system in the province, and an understanding of what it is you're trying to do to make it a better system.

What did you perceive was expected of the minister of education with respect to the education committee of Cabinet and subsequently the education committee of government Caucus?

Prior to 1979, all delegations from interest groups met with the Cabinet or Cabinet committees, like the Social Planning Committee. In 1975, the Caucus Committee on Education was formed to involve more government MLAs in policy development and to act in an advisory capacity to the minister. In 1979, Premier Lougheed expanded the role of the Caucus Committees to include receiving delegations and submissions (Lougheed, 1975 and 1979). From this point on, interest groups would meet with Caucus Committees instead of with Cabinet. This was a way to give the non-Cabinet members of the government responsibilities related to their particular interests and it was a way for the Premier to assess their potential. Any members of the Cabinet could sit in on such Caucus Committees if they wished. The chairmen of the Caucus Committees presented issues and recommendations to the full Caucus, not the minister (Lougheed, 1987).

HYNDMAN The Cabinet committees were used as sounding boards for such things as new policy, modifications to timelines or consideration of methods of financing before they went to full Cabinet. You could get a good reading as to the weak spots in your position before you went to Cabinet. You could then make modificatons to ensure that your position had a good chance of being accepted.

There was always a barrage of submissions on any policy and one did not embark on a major policy initiative without having done some "scouting" with the interest groups . I always spoke to the groups that had an interest, because I'd be asked in Cabinet or Caucus what, for example, the ATA or the ASTA or the Home and School Associations thought about the plan I was proposing, and whether they'd be supporting it or marching on the steps of the Legislature.

KOZIAK By the time I was minister there was not an education committee of Cabinet: its responsibilities had been assumed by the Social Planning Committee, of which I was a

member. I chaired it in the second year of my term. It was a place to have preliminary discussions of legislation before going to Cabinet. It did not deal with funding. The Social Planning Committee was also the first place to discuss new directions or policy. One had to be sure to get its support before one went to the Cabinet or the proposal would'nt stand a chance. The Social Planning Committee also generated some policy proposals on its own, so it was not just a place to sound ideas out. For example, we spent a lot of time in that committee discussing and developing the goals of education.

The education committee of Caucus, during my term, was the committee which reviewed education matters in more depth. It was also used as a place to discuss new legislation prior to its introduction. The committee was not involved in funding decisions.

KING All the time I was minister we never had an education committee of Cabinet because, in 1975, we established the Caucus Committees. In 1979, there was a significant switch away from Cabinet interface with the public to Caucus interface with the public.

The committees were a good notion in principle--get the private members involved and give them something to do that resembled the work of Cabinet. These committees sometime worked well, but we dumped too much work on the MLAs who served on those committees. Almost all MLAs were members of two, and in some cases four, of these committees.

We asked a lot from the committees, with virtually no support staff or system. The second problem with the committees was that they were made up of MLAs who expressed an interest in education, so when they put forward a position in Caucus, some of their impact was discounted because they were all seen as apologists for education. For the committee work itself, sometimes it would be better to have Caucus members who are not so supportive, because then you can bring them along. While I was minister, I did not make enough time for the Caucus Committee. I took them for granted, and I was always surprised when they supported me anyway.

The original motivation for establishing Caucus Committees came from Cabinet, not from the MLAs. Lougheed's notion was that the Caucus should be one team. This meant that he wanted everybody to be doing some of the same kinds of thing as the Cabinet, so the door was open a crack. He had a fixation on the term backbencher and tried to find another word for it (private member). He wanted to find ways to make each of them part of the Cabinet decision-making process and marginally inside the Cabinet tent. On reflection, after 16 months away from being on the inside, I think the government suffered for it. It meant that there was no clear separation between the Cabinet and other

members of the Caucus. I did not think Lougheed was right about this one--a separation is better.

What were your responsibilities on the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada?

HYNDMAN This was an unusual situation because Bob Clark as the previous minister was the chairman of the council. The annual meeting was to be held the second day after we were elected. Jim Foster and I went as the Alberta delegation, and the vice chairman from another province, along with Jim and I, took over the chair for the meeting. In general, the council met once or twice a year. Its purpose seemed to be primarily to fend off the federal government's encroachment on the province's jurisdiction over educational matters, but it was also a good time for fellowship and an opportunity to exchange information about common problems and solutions. It was a forum for persuasion; because it had no power to act, it was only advisory to each province. Convincing the federal government to go through the provinces rather than give grants directly was one of its tasks.

KOZIAK The minister of advanced education and I both attended the council meetings which were held two or three times a year. The membership of representatives of the Northwest Territories (NWT) and the Yukon was always an issue because they were really under federal authority. The NWT and the Yukon were not full fledged members but attended as observers. The Council was unique in that it was really strictly a provincial body and anyone else who attended (including federal representatives) did so only at the invitation of the council.

The Council spent the vast majority of its time dealing with French language questions because the federal government was providing part of the funding. It also spent a good deal of time on the protection of provincial rights in education against intrusion by the federal government. It was a good place to share experiences about Alberta and hear what was going on in the rest of Canada that might benefit Alberta. Some of its activities led to joint efforts. The council had a secretariat and it studied bilingualism in education and other topics. It was the place we offered the Alberta Heritage learning resources materials to other provinces.

KING I enjoyed working on the Council and was chairman in 1985. For most of the seven years I was minister, I was one of the two or three most active members. I tried to get things done. The portability of teacher certificates was a goal of mine. We got an

agreement, and every minister endorsed it, but it was never implemented. This was a big disappointment to me.

The Council is not an organization without power to act. Even today, it has the largest standing bureaucracy of any interprovincial organization of ministers in Canada. When I was chairman in 1985, the budget was $2 million and in 1986 it spent $1 1/2 million. It produced standards for curriculum, to foster compatibility from province to province. While it can't direct a common curriculum for all schools in the country, the standards are being applied across Canada. The Council developed resource materials and compiled and maintains a computerized Francophone bibliography of resource materials in conjunction with the secretary of state. It also works with the Office of the Secretary of State on student exchanges.

Role Behavior

Role behavior is defined as actions performed and interactions conducted by the person occupying the role. The participants were asked to described the ways in which they performed their role as minister in the government dimension.

How would you describe your style of operation as a minister in the government?

HYNDMAN I tried to encourage two-way communication. I did not want to be seen to be acting in a way that was arbitrary or capricious. I tried to encourage questioning and to review all possible policy options in education. I liked to have more than one option and always objected if I was only given one choice by my officials. I insisted that whatever we did had to be in language that was understandable to me and to the public who were not versed in educational jargon. [Hyndman made a particular point of explaining this belief in his first speech to the Legislature as minister in 1972.] I knew that lawyers were guilty of this, and I was sure educators were guilty of it too. I tried to operate with a team approach on the basis that we were all colleagues in the enterprise. I tried to avoid a confrontation approach.

KOZIAK The style depended on what was appropriate for the groups with which I would be meeting. During my term, I most vividly recall my dealings with the interest groups. These stand out more in my mind than my activity with the education committee of Caucus, for example. I encouraged groups to meet with me. I tried to respond to them on the

issues they raised. I liked to have a written brief Having the brief well in advance also meant you could research the issues and determine if there was anything that could be done. Then you could use the meeting as a successful process and accomplish something, rather than simply as an introduction to a problem or a springboard for another meeting.

In terms of style, I liked to get out of the office when I could and visit the far reaches of the province. The Northland situation was one issue that allowed me to do this.

KING Overall, I tried to get across the idea that the education system was basically good, and that it was one my colleagues should be proud of, that it was not in crisis, and that we could make something good even better. 1. For myself, I wanted to instill pride in, and to opt for, education. I tend to be an optimist, I always see the glass as half full. 2. With regard to the institution, I wanted to convey both enthusiasm and impatience, to be seen as a doer, even on the tough matters. 3. In terms of the public, I wanted to persuade them that in a political conflict they should support the minister rather than anybody else because the minister had the best interests of the whole system at heart while others would be self-interested.

In terms of adminstrative style, correspondence in my office caused a lot of trouble because I tried to read all of it. When we counted the number of letters in and out, at the end of my term, it was about ten times what Julian Koziak had recorded at the end of his term. I was never satisfied with the drafts prepared for me and often sent them back to the department four or five times before they were mailed out. As a result, turn around time in my office was bad. From an organizational point of view, that is my own greatest disappointment. However, I thought that if someone took the time to contact me they deserved more than a two-paragraph answer; more than likely they got two pages.

What was your relationship with other ministers? Other government MLAs?

HYNDMAN I was an advocate for the system, but we were all in the government business together. I tried to avoid confrontation with other ministers and to provide them with the information they needed. Government MLAs had immediate access to me on education matters at any time whether the House was sitting or not. I would get back to them myself, have someone in the department talk to them, or have the deputy or the department people call the local people if it was a school board problem. I'd also advise school board chairmen about an issue that was their responsibility, and suggest that they should do something about it, or offer to work together with them to solve the problem.

KOZIAK I thought my relationship with other ministers and MLAs was excellent. There was a daily routine of answering questions that they had about education, but I expect this was the same for all ministers. I gave them assistance or got back to them on questions or problems that they raised or that had been raised by their constituents about education. I had more contact with the minister of advanced education because of our joint responsibility for ACCESS and because both of us attended the meetings of the CMEC. That meant that we had to have our act together in making presentations to both these bodies.

KING I had an open door policy with other Cabinet members and MLAs. I used to invite MLAs in for breakfast to talk about education and other things the government was doing. I thought it was good politics in Caucus and for education. I also tried to include the MLAs wherever I was visiting to ensure that, where possible, they got the credit for solving problems in, or getting information to, their constituency related to education.

I had a sporadic relationship with the Caucus Committee, and that may have been the biggest political failure of my term as minister of education. It's partly a comment on me and partly on the way the whole committee structure was organized in Caucus. While the session was on, I had Cabinet for one half day per week (in which we tried to do what we normally do in a whole day when the Legislature is not in session), Cabinet committees (each took one-half day per week), Caucus meetings (45minutes every day and four hours on Thursday), committees of the Legislative Assembly, constituency work, visits from constituents, meetings with interest groups (they always want to meet you when the House was in session because they can catch a lot of MLAs at once), Caucus Committees, and meetings with the deputy and others in the Department of Education. In addition, I had to properly prepare myself to present and debate resolutions. Most of this activity is invisible to the public.

Propositions

An analysis of the responses gives rise to the following series of propositions formulated to draw together the significant elements.of the role of minister of education in Alberta in the government dimension.

FORMALLY PRESCRIBED REQUIREMENTS:

1. The minister of education as a member of the Cabinet is bound to maintain Cabinet solidarity and secrecy.

2. The minister must execute the powers and trusts of the position as stipulated in legislation and regulations.

3. The minister is assumed to be the education expert in Cabinet.

4. The minister of education assumes the primary responsibility for program, policy, financial, and political decisions in education on behalf of the government.

5. The minister is required to publicly disclose personal assets or place them in a blind trust for the duration of the term as minister.

INFORMAL EXPECTATIONS:

6. The minister of education is expected to be an advocate for education.

7. Other members of Cabinet expect the minister to know what the major interest groups think of proposals dealing with education.

8. The minister is to communicate government decisions about education to others in the education community.

9. The minister is to act as the government spokesman on education, both within and outside the province.

10. Different ministers of education view the notion of ministerial discretion differently.

11. The minister is to defend the education portion of the budget in Cabinet.

12. The minister is to assist other government MLAs on matters related to education, by providing information and solving education problems in their constituencies.

13. The minister is to be able to convince Caucus of the wisdom of proposed government action on education.

14. The minister is expected to protect provincial jurisdiction over education from the encroachment of the federal government.

15. The minister should work with, but not dominate, the education committee of Caucus.

ROLE BEHAVIOR:

16. Different ministers have different styles of operation.

17. A minister of education's style of operation determines the kind of relationships he or she establishes with Cabinet colleagues and other government MLAs.

18. The power of ministers in Cabinet or Caucus derives from their capacity to persuade their colleagues of the rightness of their arguments.

19. The minister must always be accessible to other government members regarding education matters.

20. The minister must act to ensure that other government MLAs are supportive of positions taken on education.

LEGISLATURE DIMENSION

This dimension comprises those aspects of the role of the minister of education in the Legislative Assembly and involves the doctrine of ministerial responsibility, parliamentary tradition and relationships with other members of the government, the opposition, the Speaker and the minister's constituents as MLA.

Formally Prescribed Requirements

While not strictly a legal prerequisite to holding the office, being a member of the Legislative Assembly is a tradition in Alberta and in Canada (except in rare instances).

Oath of Allegiance as a Member of the Legislative Assembly

In Alberta, a person declared elected by the returning officer automatically becomes a member of the Assembly eight days after the announcement of the results, barring any appeal (Parliamentary Counsel Office, 1986, p.1). To formalize the appointment, minister's of education who have not been in the Legislative Assembly before, swear an Oath of Allegiance, an oath which all members of the Legislative Assembly must "take and subscribe to" before being permitted to take their places in the Assembly. It reads as follows:

> I, _____, do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Her heirs and successors according to law. So help me God.

In the case of reelection, an affirmation of allegiance is sworn, which reads:

> I, _____, do solemnly and truly declare and affirm that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Her heirs and successors according to law.
>
> (Parliamentary Counsel Office, 1986, p.1)

Other Formal Requirements

The rules of the Legislative Assembly require that every member must attend the sittings of the Assembly unless excused by the Speaker. The member must also, by Section 31 of the Legislative Assembly Act, file declarations of direct associates with the Clerk of the Assembly (Parliamentary Counsel Office, 1986, p. 5-6).

As minister of education, what were your formal responsibilities in the Legislature?

HYNDMAN There are no strictly formal requirements except those which are accepted as part of legislative history and parliamentary tradition. In this respect, there are the requirements to: 1. pilot legislation through the legislative process -- first reading and introduction, second reading, amendments in committee, 3rd reading, proclamation and royal assent; 2. present the budget estimates for education; 3. speak on behalf of education, answer the opposition's questions, correct them when they were wrong and supply information orally or in writing or provide responses requested in returns; 4. use the Legislature to make announcements; 5. inform the House and the public of new government policy and defend policy presented by the government in throne speeches or elsewhere.

KOZIAK 1. To be answerable to the Legislature on education. 2. To attend, to answer questions when asked, and respond to motions for return. 3. To present the estimates for the education portion of the budget.

KING To answer questions in the House pertaining to education; to introduce legislation or to watch colleagues present legislation, to take the estimates of the department through the Committee of Supply, to watch the progress of resolutions, especially private members

motions related to education, and to keep an eye on matters that might tangentially touch on education.

The doctrine of ministerial responsibility in Canada, based on the British model, expects that the minister is accountable to the Legislative Assembly for his actions and the actions of his department. As minister of education, how did you interpret this convention?

HYNDMAN I was responsible for the actions of all the members of the staff of the Department of Education and, to the degree set out in the acts governing their activity, also for teachers and trustees, but to a lesser degree. I had the authority to remove school boards, but I assumed that they were ultimately responsible for their actions even though the public asked me to correct things for which the boards were responsible. As minister, I had the responsibility to ensure that local boards got the money that was coming to them and that they had a plan to do what was required of them under the School Act; I could be held responsible if they did not. I was responsible for dealing with the broader issues which affected all Albertans. If something bad happened, such as a school bus accident, I was expected to take steps to prevent it happening again or at least investigate and change the regulations if necessary.

In regard to the requirement to resign if something went wrong, every minister was asked to resign by the opposition at least once a month. But I had to explain that what usually happened was not the decision of the minister personally, but of someone else to whom the responsibility had been delegated. If I made a major error, I would have to resign.

With regard to individual teacher behavior, it was my responsibility to see that standards and remedies were in place; I was not responsible for the individual actions of a teacher.

KOZIAK It is not set down in legislation but everyone assumes that the minister is answerable to the Legislature on educational policy in line with the parliamentary customs and traditions we have in this province. When specific legislation to deal with a problem does not exist, the minister is responsible and is asked why legislation is not in place. The minister also has to win over the Legislature on legislation and the budget and get support for the policies of the government.

If studies showed that the students in Alberta were the worst in the world because of my policies, I'd have to resign. There were never any such studies; in fact the OECD report was pretty glowing about Alberta.

As the minister, I couldn't possibly keep track of everything that was going on. I couldn't have done my job if I was involved in the everyday running of the department; I had to trust the professionals in the department.

I was responsible for determining policy and for identifying what information I needed for decision-making purposes Basically, I relied on the advice of the people in the department unless something told me to do otherwise.

KING I was directly responsible for matters of policy and for major matters touching on the administration of the department. For example, I had to ensure that we spent our budget on things that were in line with the budget votes of the Legislature. In addition, the minister has a responsibility to the Legislature for everything that happens in the department. If something goes wrong that the minister should reasonably have been expected to know about then he should resign. "Know about" conveys the power to correct. If something happens that should not have and the minister knew about it and did nothing, he should resign.

Informal Expectations

The participants were asked what others, such as the Premier, government and opposition MLAs, constituents, and the media expected the minister of education to do in the Legislature.

In addition to the formal requirements, what did you perceive was expected of you in the Legislature by the Premier and other members of the government?

HYNDMAN I was expected to be in the House during question period. The Premier expected me to argue intelligently and to support the decisions of Cabinet, even the ones I lost in Cabinet. He expected that I would have an early warning system for potential problems and have contingency plans to prevent problems from getting out of hand. He expected that, if I had a problem, I would solve it quickly so that it did not become incendiary. I was also expected to be ready to answer questions from the opposition and the media.

KOZIAK The Premier never expressly said "This is the way I want you to act." If a minister did something the Premier didn't like or if he wasn't happy with the way the

minister answered a question, he would send a pink slip to the minister immediately. We used to call them "bullets."

KING The Premier expected that all ministers would show leadership; that they would not be defensive but would always be looking for ways to make things better. Irrespective of their departmental responsibilities, they were expected to vigorously participate in the work of the Assembly. Other government members expected the minister to follow the debate closely and to be helpful when he could. On the other hand, these same members also wanted to contribute to the debates on education and they didn't want to be overshadowed by the minister, who had other opportunities of his own to comment. The minister was expected to provide time for other members to comment if they wished.

What did you perceive was expected of you in the Legislature by the opposition?

HYNDMAN I think the opposition expected me to make some major errors, drop the ball, make large mistakes, not give them all the information, and be difficult to deal with if they did not have their facts straight. My office was open to them for non-partisan matters regarding education and they could refer problems to me in the same way as other MLAs could. They'd also try to get information that could be potentially embarrassing to the government; that is the nature of the adversarial system.

KOZIAK From 1975 to 1979 there was very little opposition. The opposition expected the minister to flounder. They were there to embarrass the government, but they had very little material to work with. They'd raise questions in the House on things they believed the government was not doing enough about. They expected me to answer their questions, to provide returns when I said I would, and to be as accurate as possible if I had the information. If I made a major policy announcement, they expected me to provide all the details on the spot. The opposition was there to make points, and the minister was there to give information and explain policies, positions, legislation, and funding.

KING They expected fairly direct answers to their questions and direct responses to their requests for information. In my experience, private and informal contacts between ministers and members of the opposition are not nearly as partisan as exchanges on the floor of the Assembly. There were many cases in which there were theatrical exchanges on the floor, yet rational conversation in the members' lounge behind the Assembly or in my

office that solved the problem. In the parliamentary tradition, it may be the role of the opposition to make the government look bad. Maybe they did expect us to falter, but, on the other hand, frequently they just wanted to get the information out to the public or to extract a public statement of government policy so that they could compare it with their own positions. On occasion, we might give them the answer and make them look foolish for asking the question.

What did you perceive was expected of you in the Legislature by the Speaker?

The conduct of the business of the Assembly and the deportment of its members are governed by parliamentary procedure, which is a combination of the formal written rules called Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta and the unwritten practice of the Assembly developed by interpretation and the Speaker's rulings (Parliamentary Counsel Office, 1986, p. 17).

HYNDMAN That I would speak in the Legislature when called on to do so and follow the rules of the Assembly.

KOZIAK Not really anything, except to follow the rules of the House.

KING The Speaker during the time that I was a member was very unusual if not unique among Speakers of Assemblies: he wanted an orderly Assembly. He wanted ministers to adhere to all the rules and precedents when making any kind of contribution in the Assembly, and he expected the same thing from the opposition members. He was much narrower in the interpretation of those rules than any other Speaker that I know of, and, by and large, I think we were pretty well served by that. Some may have wished debate to be more free wheeling, but, considering the reputation of other assemblies such as Parliament or the B. C. or Ontario Legislatures, I have never regretted the quiet comparison that people make of our Assembly.

As the Speaker was responsible for seeing that responses to written questions and orders for return provided members with what they had asked for and what had been offered, the Speaker wanted ministers to produce what they promised.

What did you perceive as the expectations of you in the Legislature by constituents?

HYNDMAN My constituents had elevated expectations about what I'd be able to do for the area once I became minister of education. They thought all the schools would be build and equipped and beautiful and that they wouldn't have to wait for new curriculum or supplies. Their expectations were heightened because my kids were going to school in the constituency and when I'd be over at the school for activities, teachers could speak directly to the minister of education. They all thought, "Boy, I've got a direct pipeline into the government." But it was good for me, too, because, once they got comfortable with me, I got an unfiltered view of education; teachers and parents were not afraid to "tell it like it was." As their MLA, I also toured all the schools in my constituency once a year.

KOZIAK From 1975 to 1979, my constituency was primarily the inner city area, which had few active operating schools. It did not include the university area as it did later when I was no longer minister of education. Very few constituents came to visit me about education at the Legislature. Their expectations were more with respect to matters other than education.

KING Most of my constituents were not very aware of the role I played in the Legislature as the minister. I don't think they had any expectations in this regard. When I went door to door, they were concerned almost exclusively about what I did for them as their MLA, but not what I had done in my role as minister.

During the 1986 election campaign I was startled by the number of my constituents who didn't know, or didn't recall, that I was minister of education.

Role Behavior

The participants were asked to describe how they translated the formal requirements and informal expectations into action as demonstrated by their role behavior.

How would you describe your style of operation in the Legislature?

HYNDMAN I tried to be informative. If I had the answer, I'd give it; if I didn't, I'd say so and promise to get back to them. The Legislature was the proper forum to get information to the opposition, the media and the public, and I used it to advantage. I instituted a written Hansard to the Legislature in 1972, so there was a permanent record of the proceedings. We also brought television into the Assembly.

If I didn't know something, I said so, particularly when Bob Clark was the opposition critic for education, because he had such a better information base than I did when I started. If the opposition said something that was not correct, I'd correct them or unleash all guns if I had to. But I didn't like to do that very often. Playing the game was part of the fun of the Legislature.

Basically, I tried to keep the temperature down, because I did not think that education profitted from a world war going on or from name calling in the House. I believed education deserved to be debated in a thoughtful manner, and so I used this approach. It was difficult sometimes, particularly if we were exploring the reactions to a new policy that was still secret, and I couldn't give the opposition all the answers they wanted. While we were in opposition we tried to keep the temperature up, get the government angry, upset, and off balance. When we got into government, the Premier used to drill the Cabinet by role playing. He'd play the leader of the opposition and ask us difficult questions. It worked because we were ready when we got to question period. The benefit of once being in opposition was that we knew what they were up to.

I liked to keep my cool and have my facts straight. If I did, question period was great fun and an opportunity to send information out to the rest of the province. It was a great communication tool.

KOZIAK I did not like to be abrasive, and I did not go out to embarrass anyone. Fairness was important. If the opposition's questions were potentially embarrassing, I liked to turn them around and provide an answer that was very positive. In general, my goal was to turn the heat down. I had to be careful with my responses because the education interest groups read Hansard religiously. They pour over it to find any hidden meaning they can. This does not occur to the same extent in other portfolios, and certainly not in municipal affairs. This is because, in education, the minister has a different role than the minister of municipal affairs. In municipal affairs the government is not the major source of funding. In education the government sets the actual curriculum in which everybody has a stake, it provides the major source of funding, and there is a much closer relationship among the

minister, school boards, teachers, parents and others. School boards have less flexibility than do municipal councils. There are more groups that the minister of education has to deal with, and everybody wants to bypass the trustees to get to the minister.

KING I wanted to be an effective communicator in the Assembly, and an effective proponent, and, to a certain extent, an effective, constructive critic of education. I tried to treat everything seriously. I liked to debate procedure, and, as a deputy House leader, I'd sometimes get embroiled in procedural wrangles, in which I was quite partisan. When I spoke on education immediately before or after such a procedural debate, sometimes that partisanship slipped into my comments, but I hope that lasted only briefly.

Propositions

To summarize the Legislature dimension of the role of minister of education, the following propositions have been formulated.

FORMALLY PRESCRIBED REQUIREMENTS:

21. The minister of education is required to swear faithfulness and allegiance to the Queen.

22. The minister must adhere to the rules of the Legislative Assembly as enunciated by the Speaker.

23. The minister is responsible for presenting to the Legislature new legislation, government policy, and budget estimates for education .

24. Whenever possible the minister must attend the Legislative Assembly while it is in session.

25. In the Legislature the minister is required to answer questions about education posed by other members of the Assembly.

26. The minister must answer to the Legislature for personal actions and for the actions of those employed in the Department of Education, and should resign if a serious error or impropriety is committed that the minister could have prevented.

27. The minister is required to ensure that standards and regulations are in place to guide the behavior of others providing education in Alberta.

INFORMAL EXPECTATIONS:

28. When speaking or voting in the Legislature, the minister of education is expected by the Premier to support the decisions of Cabinet.

29. The minister is expected to show leadership in the Legislature and to anticipate potential difficulties with educational legislation and policy.

30. The opposition expects the minister of education to make mistakes on which it can capitalize politically.

31. The minister is to be the opposition's principal adversary on education matters.

32. The minister is expected by the Speaker to answer questions in the Legislature in a direct manner.

33. The minister is expected to use the Legislature as a forum for providing information to the opposition, the media, and the public.

34. The minister is expected by the Speaker to help maintain order and decorum while in the Assembly.

35. The voters in the minister's constituency have little interest in the Legislature activities of the minister of education.

ROLE BEHAVIOR:

36. Different incumbents translate the role requirements and expectations of the minister of education in the Legislature dimension differently.

37. One of the roles of the minister of education in the Legislature is to keep the political temperature down.

38. The minister of education must demonstrate an open, honest, serious attitude when dealing with education in the Legislature.

39. The minister should be positive about education.

40. The minister of education is expected to be an effective communicator and debater.

PARTY DIMENSION

This dimension involves the requirements, expectations, and role behavior of the minister of education as a member of the political party that forms the government in Alberta. In most of the rest of Canada, mainstream political parties have predominated as the governments of the provinces but, as was noted in Chapter IV, this has not been Alberta's history. From the United Farmers of Alberta, to the Social Credit Party, to the Lougheed Conservatives, Alberta has had a variety of political parties in power, each with its unique philosophies, goals, and objectives for education in the province. This

dimension looks at the activities of the minister's involvement with the party executive and its members.

Formally Prescribed Requirements

In Canada, political party membership usually requires that the individual agree with the philosophy of the party and abide by its rules and regulations. These undertakings assume a higher level of commitment when the individual decides to become a candidate in an election as a member of the Legislative Assembly. When the person is elected and appointed as a minister of the government, the level of commitment and responsibility within the party changes again, and new requirements and expectation come into play.

The first requirement of the minister explored in this dimension is that of responding to party policy. The March 2, 1972, throne speech of the first Progressive Conservative government in Alberta's history, mirrored the promises made by the Lougheed opposition during the election campaign leading up to its victory in the provincial general election of August 30, 1971. Education and assistance to the handicapped were high on the list of priorities. The party was so new, that except for the NOW slogan and its campaign promises, little if any substantive policy on education existed. Indeed, it was not until the party's annual convention in April, 1976 that its leader Peter Lougheed presented a set of goals and objectives for the Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta, which was to serve as the foundation of party philosophy. In that document, education headed the list of party objectives:

> 1. To continue to provide the highest quality education, health care and overall public service while providing sound fiscal management of the province's affairs. (Progressive Conservative Association of Alberta, 1980)

In addition to having a statement of goals and objectives, the party passes resolutions each year at its annual convention that reflect discussions held during party

policy conferences. The resolutions are submitted by constituency associations from across the province. While a constituency may submit more than one resolution, only its top priority resolution is debated and voted on by the assembled delegates. The remainder are simply referred to Caucus for information. Of the resolutions that are debated, most include the preamble "Be it resolved that the Alberta government . . . " and then proceed to request the Caucus to take action, adopt a position, or change some act or regulation. While this is not much different from the procedure of any other interest or pressure group, what is interesting is the information in the convention policy handbook which reads

> The resolutions actually under consideration in each case will be: "that Resolution No. __ be referred to the party Caucus for appropriate action." All resolutions which are in this way commended to Caucus by the delegates will be reported upon to the next annual meeting. (Progressive Conservative Association of Alberta, 1982)

In terms of education resolutions, the only formal requirement of the minister is to report the action of the government at the next meeting. Compliance with the letter or intent of the resolution is a matter of complete Caucus discretion, effectively relegating the party's policy to the status of advice rather than direction. Examples of the kind of advice offered to the minister of education through convention resolutions in this way have included: impose wage guidelines on public service employees; establish class size limitations; provide Alberta job information to Grade 9 to 12 students; reinstitute departmental examinations; standardize the core subjects; provide assistance to special education students; provide long-range planning and research in education; offer consumer education in the curriculum; provide tax equality for separate school districts; replace locally appointed superintendents (extracted from Progressive Conservative Association Resolutions Booklets, 1978 to 1982).

In addition to receiving, considering and responding to party policy, the minister as an MLA must also maintain contact with constituents and party members, including those

who helped the minister get elected. Administratively, there is a traditional requirement for the minister to keep separate the activities of the party constituency office and the office of the minister of education. The separation extends to a prohibition on the overt use of legislative staff and services for party activities.

With regard to the role of the minister in the party dimension, the participants were asked to describe the relationship between party and government policy and to highlight formal party requirements on the minister.

Please explain the relation between party policy and government policy in regard to education.

HYNDMAN Party policy reflected decisions of annual general meetings and policy conferences. Government policy has to fulfill the commitments made during the election and is prepared in consultation with the MLAs, the minister who has been in touch with all the interest groups, all the constituents, and the department people. For the most part, party policy parallels government policy, but sometimes party policy is decided at an annual meeting or policy convention in seven minutes of debate on Saturday afternoon in a hotel in Calgary. Therefore it must be put in perspective, and modified because it has not had the appropriate degree of attention.

Party policy and government policy basically were two different streams in the same river. They were going in the same direction but the timing of implementation and emphasis could be different.

KOZIAK Prior to 1971, the party platform was established, and this formed the basis of government policy once we were elected. For education, a major influence at that time was the Worth commission report. After 1971, when government policy was in place, the minister's responsibilities at the annual sessions consisted mostly of answering questions from the party members, and responding to criticisms of the public about education that were articulated by party delegates. There were resolutions which were voted on, and these would be taken into account when the government Caucus was deciding policy.

KING In theory, party policy leads government policy. When the party in office changes, government policy changes, too, because party philosophy is the basis of government policy. However, once the government has been in office for a time, it begins to plagiarize

the views and attitudes of the bureaucracy and other interest groups. You have to remember there is big "G" government, which is the Executive Council and all the legislative surroundings, and then there is little "g" government which is the governing party that temporarily holds the power. The government's views become more empathetic towards groups with which it regularly interacts, and its positions become more similar to all the groups with which it has contact. Policy, therefore, evolves out of the increasing contact with all the interest groups and individuals around the province.

During my term, I went against the grain of this conventional evolution and, instead of becoming more empathetic, I gradually became less willing to accept what I heard from many of the major, well-established, traditional interest groups.

What were the formal responsibilities of the minister of education in relation to the party?

HYNDMAN To listen to and communicate with the party and the party executives; to keep the party informed of educational policy; to listen to what was happening in their areas of the province; and to attend the annual meetings.

There was a responsibility to keep the Premier informed about what was happening in the province, to provide him with information for speeches he had to make, and to keep him up to date on the progress of implementing education commitments made during the election.

KOZIAK There were no formal requirements that I can think of.

KING There were no formal written responsibilities. The constitution of the Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta is absolutely silent on the question of responsibilities of the minister to the party. But in terms of customs and traditions, Cabinet ministers are expected to attend the annual convention and to participate in the programs of those meetings when requested. Ministers are also formally expected to attend the fall policy conferences, participate in the programs and, on occasion, present a background, position or briefing paper. Ministers are expected to attend meetings of constituency associations on occasion (for example, annual general meetings). They are expected to recruit, prepare, and promote new party workers (the "evergreen" approach to party leadership).

Informal Expectations

Informal expectations in the party dimension include those things expected of the minister of education by the leader of the party, the party members and the party executive. With the exception of individual requests, the majority of such expectations revolve around the party activities held during the year. For the Conservative Party in Alberta, these events include the annual convention (spring), policy conferences (fall), leadership conventions (as called), candidate selection meetings (prior to elections), constituency meetings, fund raisers, and membership drives. The minister of education is expected to separate most involvement in these activities from legislative responsibilities and to attend these functions as a party member or candidate, not as the minister of education. However, there are some expectations of the minister at party functions.

What was expected of you at party meetings as minister of education?

HYNDMAN I was responsible for listening and providing information on request in the panel and bear pit sessions at the policy meetings.

KOZIAK There was always a session on education, sometimes with separate meetings just on education. There were also hot-seat sessions. The minister was not expected to make policy announcements at these meetings. I was expected to tell them what was going on in education, what I had done lately, and how policies had been implemented.

We did not actually pass policy at the convention. There were resolutions that, if passed, we were expected to implement. We also had to explain to the party when and how the resolutions were implemented or give a reason if they were not. Now, if there was a resolution on the floor that was going to be a problem, the minister was expected to marshall his forces to make sure that resolution did not pass. If it was not going to be a problem and the minister wanted to implement, he made sure it did pass.

KING I was expected to travel to party functions, speak at events organized by the constituencies around the province and generally promote the party at fund raising activities and the like. At provincial meetings I was expected to be aware of the resolutions being proposed by the delegates and to know why they were being proposed. I was expected to

make information about education available to the delegates so that they could make the best decisons possible. The minister was not expected to speak too much in debate, but to participate judiciously. As a Cabinet minister, I was expected to mingle at these events, visit all the hospitality suites (not just those of my constituency), be visible, listen, and generally be in contact with the delegates. Before such meetings, I was also expected to help contituency associations draft their educational resolutions. Sometimes I did this in person and sometimes I did it with a conference telephone call.

Party organization and constituency association views were important, but I always had to weigh them against the views of the entire community that elected me and to which I owed allegiance because I represented them in the Legislature.

Role Behavior

For this aspect of the party dimension, the participants were asked whether there were difficulties in being an MLA and at the same time the minister of education.

How did you handle wearing the two hats of MLA and minister of education in the constituency?

HYNDMAN People in my constituency would think something should be done and, as their MLA, I'd like to make it happen. But as the minister of education, I'd have to say, for example, that the government didn't have the money to do it, so that was the bottom line. The minister must support government policy. The problem never really arose in my constituency because the people in the area generally agreed with the positions of the government; that's probably why they continued to elect me! As a member of the Cabinet, I was assumed to know what was going on in areas other than education.

KOZIAK Except for a French language school, there were very few other operating schools in my constituency. The electors saw me primarily as their MLA even though they knew that I was in Cabinet. The conflict between my role as an MLA and as a minister of education did not arise. I got very few, if any, representations about education from my constituents during my term as minister of education. There was little clambering from parents about schools. School closures came up, but that was the responsibility of school boards. Not much of my time as MLA was spent on education while I was minister except for French schools.

KING This was no particular problem but there were times when, as minister, I might vote against the wishes of my constituency and in favor of education in general. In those cases, the best approach was to let people know that I was in a conflict-of-interest situation and that I was making the decision as the minister, not as their MLA. In the early days of my term, another kind of situation arose that might apply here. The Minister was responsible for approving the designations of community schools. There was an expectation that these schools would be spread around the province and that the minister would be careful not to use them as patronage. I approved two community schools in my constituency, but advised Caucus in advance that, as the minister, I was designating those particular schools because it was educationally sound to do so, not because they were in my constituency. I gave Caucus the chance to object. They didn't, and the designations went ahead. The key is that you have to be open about what you are doing.

In some ways the opposite question is more difficult for a minister: Do the responsibilities as minister conflict with your role as MLA? In education, the answer is definitely yes because the mandate in education is so large and takes so much of the minister's time that sometimes his constituency gets neglected. Sometimes, even though I wanted to intervene for the sake of my constituency or for my own children, the ramifications of such an intervention on the whole province would prevent me from solving the problem in my own constituency.

Propositions

To summarize the party dimension of the role of minister of education, the following propositions have been formulated

FORMALLY PRESCRIBED REQUIREMENTS:

41. The minister of education is required to follow the precepts of the party philosophy and to abide by the party rules and regulations.

42. The minister must attend annual party conventions and policy conferences to answer questions about education from the delegates.

43. The minister is required to report back to the party on government disposition of policy resolutions passed at party conventions.

44. The minister should keep party activities separate from legislative functions.

INFORMAL EXPECTATIONS:

45. The minister of education, as a Cabinet minister, is expected to encourage support for the party whenever appropriate.

46. The minister should assist the party leader to explain government policy to the members.

47. The minister is expected to answer party members' questions about education and to provide advice and assistance to members on educational issues.

ROLE BEHAVIOR:

48. There is potential for the role of minister of education and the role of member of the Legislative Assembly to conflict in terms of time and allegiance.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION DIMENSION

The Department of Education dimension of the minister's role involves the minister's responsibilities as spelled out in the various acts and regulations in which the minister is cited, the informal expectations of the deputy minister and others in the department and the role behavior of the minister in relation to the department.

Formally Prescribed Requirements

The formal requirements in the Department of Education dimension include the formal obligations, the "shall" requirements, and the discretionary authority, the "may" clauses, as set down in the various Alberta statutes dealing with education. The two principal acts which govern kindergarten to grade 12 education in the province and which involve the minister of education directly are the Department of Education Act and the School Act.

Obligations under the Department of Education Act

In 1971, when Lou Hyndman took office as minister of education, the formal obligations of the minister in The Department of Education Act (RSA 1970, chapter 96) included the following:

> 3. There **shall** be a department of the public service of the Province called the Department of Education over which **shall** preside the member of the Executive Council appointed by the Lieutenant Governor under the Great Seal of the Province as Minister of Education.
>
> 4. That part of the administration of the Government relating to education is under the administration of the Minister of Education unless responsibility therefor is specifically assigned to some other person.
>
> 13. The Minister **shall** report annually to the Lieutenant Governor in Council upon all schools, private schools and vocational or technical institutes with such statements as he considers necessary.

Plans had been under way to split the responsibility for education and advanced education and, as one of his first acts, Lou Hyndman introduced a bill to revise the Department of Education Act to create a new portfolio for advanced education. None of the "shall" clauses were amended at this time.

Further amendments were made in 1973, 1976, 1977, 1978, and 1979. A consolidation occurred in 1980 by which time clause 3 had been edited to replace the words

"the public service of the Province" with " the Government", clause13 had disappeared, and one more "shall" provision had been added on school books and supplies. Under RSA 1980, chapter D-7, section 14(1), if the minister decided to have school books printed or published or if he purchased school books for subsequent sale to school boards, teachers, or others, he was obliged under section 14(2) to establish a revolving fund for such purposes, the advances from which could not exceed $10,000,000 [at the time of writing this limit has been increased to $40,000,000]:

> 14(2) The Minister **shall** establish and administer a revolving fund for the purposes of subsection (1), and the Provincial Treasurer shall , on the requision of the Minister, advance from and out of the General Revenue Fund to the revolving fund those sums of money that are required for the purpose of subsection (1).

Discretionary authority under the Department of Education Act.

The discretionary authority of the minister , outlined in the Department of Education Act, stems primarily from clause 4, which allows the minister to delegate his authority to other persons. In addition to this general authority to delegate, the "may" clauses elsewhere in the Act fall under the following headings: a) appointments, b) advisory committees, c) regulations, d) grants, e) fees for service, f) prizes, g) private schools, h) investigators, i) inquiry into the administration and operation of school boards or education programs, j) official trustees of school boards or committees, k) school books and supplies and l) agreements on matters respecting education in Alberta.

Obligations under the School Act.

Investigation of provisions of the School Act RSA from 1970 to the present reveals that formally prescribed obligations of the minister of education deal primarily with the establishment, dissolution, and operation of local school authorities:

26(1) Three electors of (a) any district included in a division, or (b) any combination of districts included in a division **approved** by the Minister may petition the Minister to establish a local advisory board. . . .

26(5) If as a result of a vote at a meeting held pursuant to this section the electors request the Minister to establish a local advisory board, the Minister **shall**
(a) establish the local advisory board for the district or combinations of districts,
(b) determine the number of advisors, not exceeding 7, who will constitute the local advisory board, and
(c) determine the areas represented, if any, of each advisor.

28(2) If a plebiscite results in a vote in favour of the dissolution of the local advisory board, the fact shall be reported to the Minister, whereupon the Minister **shall** dissolve the local advisory board.

29(1) For each public school district not included in a division the Minister **shall** establish a board . . .

(2) For each separate school district established under this Act there **shall** be a board . . .

(3) For each division, the Minister **shall** establish a board . . .

(4) The Minister **shall** for each board specify the number of the trustees to be elected to the board, being not less than 3 nor more than 9.

(5) For each subdivision with a division the Minister **shall** specify the number of trustees to be elected in the subdivision.

53(1) If as a result of a vote at a meeting held under section 52 the majority of the electors voting for or against the district have voted in favour of the district the Minister by order **shall** establish the separate school district with the same boundaries of those of the public school district.

58(4) The Minister on a report of the board pursuant to subsection (3) **shall** dissolve the board of the separate school district and that district and thereupon the former separate school residents become residents of the public school district or division within whose boundaries they reside.

The other section with an obligatory provision deals with the deposits paid by parties to a board of reference:

> 98(5) Each party to the appeal shall pay his own costs unless the Board of Reference otherwise orders and in the event that no order as to costs is made, the $50 held by the Minister **shall** be repaid to the person who paid it to him.

Except for the sections cited above, there are no other "shall" clauses describing formal obligations of the minister of education in the School Act! While on the surface this may seem surprising, it should not be. As previously pointed out, the minister may, after establishing local school boards, delegate the power to administer and operate schools and programs to other persons. This is, in fact, what has been done in Alberta as in the other provinces of Canada where the operation of school districts is delegated to elected school boards. On the purely practical side, this makes sense in that the minister of education could not possibly personally administer the operation of every school and program in the province. Notwithstanding the endless debate over centralization versus decentralization, the provision of education has been, and continues to be, a local community-administered affair. It is not surprising, therefore, that the administration of schools has been delegated to local school authorities and that the formal requirements of the minister of education in the School Act are restricted almost exclusively to the establishment of local school authorities.

Discretionary authority under the School Act.

The School Act does includes a myriad of discretionary powers of the minister and they pertain to the following broad categories:

a) General -- prescribing courses of study and instructional materials, delegating powers and duties to a board, specifying languages of instruction, inspecting schools, setting examinations, providing reports on the operation of local schools, approving the local employment of superintendents, paying grant to school boards, and disposing of land or school buildings.

b) Establishing, altering boundaries and dissolving districts and divisions and establishing and dissolving local advisory boards.

c) Establishing rules for the operation of Boards of trustees.

d) Establishing rules for the organization of, and assessment and the collection of taxes for Separate School Districts.

e) Approving regulations for the Administration of districts and divisions, the employment of teachers and the establishment of boards of reference.

f) Handling of property, including land and buildings.

g) Financing, including borrowing, assessment, requisitions, board levying and collecting taxes.

h) Establishing regulations for schools including pupils, school operation, programs, tuition fees, and transportation.

i) Determining penalties for offences or breaches of the Act.

[The School Act has been completely rewritten after nearly four years of close scrutiny, study, public hearings and debate. The impetus for this activity was the patriation of the constitution and the adoption of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms by Parliament. Bill 59, the School Act, was presented in the Legislature in the spring of 1987. After further public debate, Bill 27, the School Act, was introduced by the current minister of education, Nancy J. Betkowski in May, 1988 and passed by the Legislature in June. When the new act is proclaimed, it will no doubt change the Legislative basis on which the authority of the minister will rest in Alberta.]

The participants in the study were asked a series of questions during the interviews about the formally prescribed requirements of minister of education in the Department of Education dimension.

The Department of Education Act states in part that "There shall be a department of the government called the Department of Education over which shall preside the member of the Executive Council appointed by the Lieutenant Governor under the Great Seal of the Province as the minister of education." What did "preside over" mean in this context?

HYNDMAN It meant that the minister was responsible for providing leadership and continuity with respect to the previous developments in education and for being responsible for and sensitive to public opinions, moods and trends. It also meant communicating with the major stakeholders in education. The Department of Education Act is the primary legal basis for the authority of the minister, but I think that the tradition in Alberta, distinct as it is from all the other provinces, guided my actions as minister just as much as the formal requirements.

KOZIAK It meant being responsible for the department and making decisions for it. It is not a presidential arrangement. It means being answerable for the actions of the department officials to the Legislature. I had regular meetings with the deputy minister and, when it was appropriate, with the associate deputies and the directors. The regular meetings with the deputy were on a semi-weekly basis. The minister did not oversee all that was going on, but concentrated on areas involving policy, funding and matters requiring personal attention (bush fires, representation, responsibilities under the legislation). I was involved in curriculum to some extent and to a lesser degree, the area of inspection. Some branches of the department went about their business without much ministerial involvement. Examples were the school buildings branch and the school book branch. In the mechanical, day to day things, the minister did not get much involved.

KING It means overseeing the development and implementation of policy. I only became involved in process or management to the extent that it influenced or was influenced by policy. I do not see the minister as the chief operating officer of the department. This is the deputy's job. The minister is the chief executive officer of the department. I wanted to know about anything that came to the knowledge of the deputy if it involved the law, government policy, or educational policy specifically. I wanted to know anything that would have a significant effect on our budget, on staffing in the department, on morale of the department, or morale in the education system generally. I also wanted to know when there was a problem that could not be solved expeditiously and equitably, particularly if it involved practices that were not educationally sound for students. These areas are easy to state, but it was difficult for the deputy to decide what it was he needed to tell me I had a lot of sources of information outside the department and the deputy quickly realized that. It

improved the quality of his communications with me. If the minister is only getting information through one pipeline, then the people who control that pipeline know that if they don't pass information along to him they can be reasonably certain that he's not getting it. But if the minister has many sources, then they know that, if they don't give him some information, he'll get it from someone else, in which case he's going to want to know why he did not get it from the department in the first place. Throughout my term, I think the department was reasonably objective about identifying the possible implications of, and the circumstances surrounding the issues, because they knew I would get the information from other sources anyway.

In which of the following statutes [in which the minister is cited or has an indirect interest] did you have major involvement during your term as minister of education? Minor involvement?

a) School Act
b) Department of Education Act
c) Local Authorities Election Act
d) Teaching Profession Act
e) Teachers' Retirement Fund Act
f) Students Loan Guarantee Act
g) Students Finance Act
h) Colleges Act
i) Universities Act
j) Northland School Division Act
k) School Buildings Act
l) Alberta School Trustees Association Act
m) Alberta Educational Communications Corporation Act
n) Municipal and School Administration Act
o) County Act
p) Municipal Taxation Act
q) Municipal Assessment & Equalization Act
r) Northern Development Act
s) Metis Betterment Act
t) Education of Service Men's Children Act
u) Others

HYNDMAN I'm not comfortable with using the term "minor involvement" unless it simply refers to the amount of time spent on each. At the time that one is looking at a particular piece of legislation it is a major issue, particularly to the people who have a stake in the act. During my term I spent the greatest amount of time on the School Act, Teaching Profession Act (TPA), the Teachers' Retirement Fund (TRF) Act, the Northland School Division Act, the Alberta Educational Communications Corporation (AECC) Act, the Municipal and School Administration Act, the County Act and, of course, the Department of Education

Act. The rest came up occasionally and then considerable effort occurred. The Universities Act was under another minister.

KOZIAK Major involvement--the School Act (tenure of teachers and minimum standards for teacher certification); the Department of Education Act; the Northland School Division Act (the beginnings of concentrated work on native education problems and programs); the School Buildings Act (a new formula was developed to respond to the donut effect in large cities where school boards needed funds to build schools in areas of large population even though there were empty schools in the city core.); and the AECC Act, (I was responsible for ACCESS).

Some involvement--the Alberta School Trustees' Association (ASTA) Act; the County Act (the question of representation for school matters and rotational representation in villages and towns); the TRF Act (early on it was amended to reduce the age plus service index to provide full benefits to teachers but it was probably done by regulations); and the TPA (a lot of discussion about competency and internal bylaws of the Alberta Teachers' Association, but it was in a fluid state when I was minister and there were no major confrontations or changes to that legislation).

As minister of education, I had very little involvement with the rest of the acts listed.

KING The Department of Education Act worked reasonably well and we did not revise it or refer to it very often. The School Act is the major piece of free-standing legislation that guides most of what happens in education. As a single piece of legislation, it is too lengthy, too cumbersome, and too complex. The School Act does not clearly state philosophic principles or policy and it is sometimes contradictory about what is implicit. As such, it is not a good piece of legislation for the next 20 years. We recognized these problems and, while I was minister, we set in motion a process to develop a new School Act. Unfortunately, that process did not work, and the government is now off in a direction that I don't think can be corrected, except by starting all over again from the beginning.

The acts which took a lot of my time included--the TPA (this occupied the greatest amount of my time after the School Act and the County Act); the Northland School Division Act (next after the TPA), the AECC Act (I was the chairman and member of the ACCESS board, and there was some restructuring of the Authority while I was minister).

The acts which took very little of my time included--the Local Authorities Act (which specifies who can vote and who is eligible to stand for election as a school trustee);

theTRF Act (only when we did an actuarial review or met with the Alberta Retired Teachers Association once a year); the Student's Loan Act; the Student Finance Act; the Colleges Act; the Universities Act; the School Buildings Act (which is essentially self-administering legislation); the ASTA Act; the Municipal and School Administration Act; the Municipal Taxation Act; the Municipal Assessment and Equalization Act; the Northern Development Act; the Metis Bettterment Act; and the Education of Service Men's Children Act.

With regard to the Acts above for which you indicated major involvement, please give some examples of the ministerial powers which you exercised yourself and examples of responsibilities which were delegated to the deputy minister or others.

HYNDMAN In general, relations with MLAs and the major stakeholders like the ATA, the ASTA, and the Home and School Associations were a direct responsibility of the minister. They expected me, not the deputy or other department staff, to give them the answers or information they wanted. I wanted to be consulted about any issue that had to do with policy, whether it was proposed new policy or suggestions for changes to existing legislation or regulations. Such policy might be generated by me, the Cabinet, MLAs who were hearing suggestions from their constituents, the department, or the stakeholder groups. As the elected and appointed representative of the people for education, I had an obligation to know about, be involved with, assess, and provide recommendations to Cabinet with respect to changes to policy. This meant that the policy would not be established before all the issues had been talked over and discussed with the department staff.

One thing I insisted on for policy recommended by the department, was that all other policy option alternatives had to accompany the recommendation, along with the pros and cons of the alternatives. I insisted on this procedure in the case of suggestions that came from the stakeholders too. I'd ask them to give me the reasons against their own proposals. This would usually result in a good, complete review. Then, when it came time to make a decision, or recommend a course of action to interdepartmental committees, the Caucus, or the Cabinet, I knew all the sides and all the possible arguments for and against the proposal.

Examples of those areas delegated to the deputy and the department included details of curriculum, school busing administration, safety and school buildings.

KOZIAK One cannot really separate the minister from the department. On most matters, I used a team approach, and I relied on the experience and knowledge of the deputy and the department staff. Certainly, on some matters the minister has to be directly involved. Appeals from student expulsions is an example where the minister sits in a quasi-judicial fashion to hear the case. Another example is when a school board has to be dissolved and an official trustee appointed. As minister, I'd have to be involved because it dealt with elected people, and you could not leave that to the deputy. But this did not occur while I was minister.

There were matters that I delegated to the deputy; he would report to me on their disposition, primarily to keep me informed for purposes of the Legislature and so I could advise school boards, trustees, and teachers. Generally though, the minister does not get involved in the day-to-day operation of the department.

KING There was no generalized delegation of powers by me to others related to these acts except as I've described about policy and problems at another point in this interview. I took a personal part on the board of ACCESS because we were always concerned about the extent to which the Authority was involved in school programming versus lifestyle and community education. I was therefore involved directly with the Authority at the policy level, while leaving the administration to the people at the department level.

In terms of the Northland School Division Act, I,myself, acted to remove the board, to appoint an official trustee, and to initiate the development of the new Act. The same was true on matters in the School Act and the County Act respecting school jurisdiction and boundaries. When we reorganized the school boards around Bonnyville, I was directly involved because I thought that there was a political process and outcome in which a politician should be involved. The deputy and the department did all the groundwork, but I took the final step. I was also directly involved in the Lac La Biche School Division problem (at the J. A. Williams High School) and in the annexation issue involving Edmonton and the County of Strathcona.

I also had direct involvement with the TPA because, in my view, what we were trying to achieve was going to establish a significant new direction for the legislation, the teachers and the ATA. I thought that all of the important decisions there had to be political decisions first. The TPA was not a case in which the minister could have had most things done by managers or by professionals, leaving only the final decisions to politicians. In my view, it was necessary to establish the political framework first and, had that been successful, the rest could have been left to the professionals. We had the political meetings with the ATA table officers and then we had a joint committee of professionals working on

the details. But I got reports out of that committee that led me to believe that, what I thought was an understanding of the framework, wasn't shared by the ATA. So then I had to get back in and clarify the understanding of both parties. But in the end it did not work, anyway.

Informal Expectations

In the Department of Education dimension, the minister must not only execute those responsibilities set out in the legislation but must also consider the expectations of other individuals connected to the department. The participants were asked to comment on these informal expectations.

In addition to the formal requirements, what did you perceive was expected of you by the staff in the Department of Education?

HYNDMAN I think that they expected me to advise them of the long-range goals of the government, provide leadership to the various committees, and communicate continuously, not only to stakeholders but to the community and, through the media, to the public in Alberta. I was expected to indicate the direction, priorities, and objectives for education in the province. The department staff expected me to tell them about the problems I thought we were facing, and the moods and trends for the coming months, so they knew what the department's agenda was likely going to be.

They also wanted reactions from me. Information was prepared and eventually filtered up to my office, and the people who prepared it liked to know what I thought about it. They really enjoyed the fact that I would react by sending a memo back with notes on it such as "Why?" "Statistics?" "Please compare this to other provinces." "Where did this idea come from?" "What does the ATA say about this?"

The department, not just the deputy minister, wanted access to me. For example, I'd be expected to meet with people in the department who had expertise on issues like school buildings. We'd get together to thrash out the issues and look at the alternatives. That kind of interaction helped the staff to get inside my skull to find out what I was thinking, and I believe they expected to have those opportunities.

The Department of Education people I inherited from the Social Credit government were very professional. I had the impression that, as good professionals, they were prepared to carry out the objectives of the new government of the day. At first they did not expect me to know very much about education. I had been the education critic while our

party was the opposition, but I had been trained as a lawyer. I think they probably wondered at the beginning if this lawyer was going to tie them up in legal knots!

KOZIAK Leadership, direction, spokesman, advocate, defender. Most of the accusations directed at government activity result from a lack of knowledge or experience on the part of the accuser. Thus, as the minister, you cannot be defensive. What you have to do instead is inform and thus better put the case for the decisions that are made. If the department made mistakes, you didn't defend the mistake, you pulled a Lee Iacoca. The department and the minister are a team organization. If the team is going to work together, the members of the team have to have confidence in the minister, who speaks for that team. The advocacy role of the minister extended beyond the department to education generally.

KING Everybody in the department wants the minister to demonstrate that he is proud of the department and that he will defend the department generally in Cabinet, in Caucus, in the Legislature, and in public. All departments will fail sometimes and come in for criticism. The question, then, is how do you criticize. I believe that you talk to people privately when there is a problem.

Secondly, the department people expect the minister to communicate that he is proud of education in general. They want a minister who is on the offensive, who is carrying the message out to the province, and who is generating education activity.

Thirdly, they expect the minister to be well informed about education and to be able to stand up in public and explain where education is and where it wants to be in five or 10 years.

Nobody expected access to me except the deputy minister and the four associates. Early on I surprised people in the department by involving them in briefing meetings and contacting them directly for information.

Role Behavior

In terms of role behavior of the minister in the Department of Education dimension, the relationship with the deputy minister and with the other staff of the department was of particular interest. The participants were asked about their role in selecting the departmental staff for whom they were responsible.

Who was responsible for the selection of deputy minister when you were the minister?

HYNDMAN Basically, the minister, in consultation with the Premier, selects the deputy, even though the appointment is made by Order in Council by the Cabinet.

KOZIAK There was no change when I became minister; Earl Hawkesworth was the deputy throughout my term. When a new minister is appointed, it is customary for the deputy minister to offer his resignation. Earl did that, but it was not accepted.

When there is a change, the minister has a great deal of say, but the executive council makes the final decision. The minister puts forth the suggestion on the advice of the personnel people, and the deputy minister of executive council. The Premier also has a role to play.

KING Ultimately the Premier is responsible. The actual process varies, depending on the interest of the Premier. Sometimes it was a closed competition, because the Premier wanted a particular individual or fit and that's what happened. When Earl Hawkesworth retired, the Premier and I talked about a replacement. I expressed a desire to throw the competition open, to encourage people from outside the Department of Education to apply. The Premier agreed. We retained an outside consulting firm and we advertised. The firm short-listed the candidates and we interviewed. I recommended three names to the Premier and indicated my preference. He accepted my preference and recommended Reno Bossetti to the Cabinet, and he was appointed deputy minister of education.

How were the deputy's responsibilities determined?

HYNDMAN Through discussion between the minister and the deputy. Iwould explain what I saw as the responsibilities for the deputy as the chief executive officer: to implement the policy of the government as determined by the Cabinet or the minister, to operate within a budget, to ensure that necessary resources are put together to do the job, and to spot problems and give me some advanced warning. I thought that the deputy was also responsible for offering solutions and helping me communicate government policy. Together we'd look at other matters and divide them up in terms of primary responsibility. If there was some scouting needed, he'd go down and find out what he could about it before I proceeded so I knew what was going on. With regard to management matters, I would explain what I wanted him to do. We'd also talk frequently to keep up to date and decide on ways to handle the matters that arose.

KOZIAK Regulations on public record explain what the delegated duties of the deputy are. When I was fresh in the job, the first thing I wanted to do was become informed about what the department was doing. That was my immediate goal so I could make informed decisions rather than shoot from the hip. I wanted to see that everything would run smoothly. I also wanted to know if there were any fires that needed attention. I did not have a list of things I wanted done, or that I was particularly interested in, not at the outset. I did not want to have a set agenda before I knew what was going on.

KING The deputy's duties were determined through a combination of formal and informal meetings. Reno and I had a number of lengthy conversations before he started and these continued throughout the term. We talked about the key responsibility areas for the deputy and the four associate deputies.

Who selected the staff and specified the duties for positions in the department under the deputy?

HYNDMAN This was basically the deputy minister's job, but there would be informal discussions before hand with me.

KOZIAK That was basically done by the deputy, with my consent. I was involved in certain of the upper-level positions, but staffing was done primarily on the deputy's initiative, not mine. The deputy would advise me that someone was retiring, tell me who he thought the best candidate was and seek my okay. If I did not have any concerns, he would make the decision.

In general, staffing the operation was not one of my major concerns. That was the deputy's responsibility, so I let him do it. I had very limited involvement with the determining the duties of others in the department except those of the deputy.

KING The department organized the planning retreat for the department's senior officers, and together, we established the objectives for the upcoming year and for the next three to five years. Only once, having seen a short list of candidates for a position, did I tell the deputy who I wanted him to hire, and that was because the candidate was a woman and I wanted more women in top management in the department. By and large I did not want to get involved with personnel management decisions. There were some questions of priorities and operational style that I wanted to communicate to the public, teachers and the

trustees that reflected policies and priorities of the government, and so I did want to influence those decisions.

How would you describe your relationship with the deputy minister? With other staff in the Department of Education?

HYNDMAN I think it was very good. He (Hawkesworth) liked to look at all the alternatives, like I did. He had a thoroughly professional education background, and that was a good counterbalance to my lack of background. I got along well with the other department staff too, and found them to be good people. I'd go to quite a number of their functions, I liked to walk around periodically to all the areas of the department, and during the year, we'd have informal get-togethers. I liked to drop in to the various committees once in a while to see people, let them see me, and let them hear me talk about education. It seemed to work. They knew I was interested in their ideas.

KOZIAK My working relationship with the deputy and all members of the department was very good. I felt that I could trust them and rely on their advice and judgment. The deputy was my adviser on education, finance, and project progress, because he had most of the information. He was also a manager, but he had the two associates who had pieces of that pie. He was the chief executive officer of the department and I was the chairman of the board.

No one else would have direct access to me without the deputy's knowledge, because that would undermine his authority. However, because the deputy was very busy, and could not be in all places at once, he would sometimes delegate others to take his place to meet with me. This was, most often, the associate deputies, or, if it was a financial matter, the budget officer.

KING The relationship was that I was the minister and he was the deputy! In some portfolios, the deputy runs the show at the department level. This is always more or less the case. The education department is an incredibly large, ponderous, traditional and historic institution that is very important to an awful lot of people. In education, the minister couldn't run the department alone even if he wanted to, and neither could the deputy, for that matter. It's really a matter of controlling the levers and the buttons and hoping that things happen out on the periphery the way you intend them to happen.

At best, a minister should choose a small number of things he really wants to accomplish, and either see that they are accomplished or exhaust himself trying. On either

side of that are two equally inappropriate situations: one in which the minister comes in satisfied to be purely symbolic and does not even have a list of things he wants to do or personal goals that are important to him; or one in which the minister wants to do everything and accomplishes nothing, not from lack of identifying jobs that need to be done, but as a result of trying to get too much done.

For me, there were four or five things I wanted to accomplish and if there was a conflict between me and the deputy on those matters, then I won. There were other things happening that were very important to education but were not on my list and they were in the hands of the deputy. To cite a few examples, nobody in the department wanted to initiate discussions on a new Teaching Profession Act so I did that over the objections of the department. Once we started those talks, nobody in the department wanted the model that was used as the basis for the discussions with the ATA; I insisted on that. The decision to locate the correspondence school in Barrhead was made by the minister. The decision to continue community schools with separate funding was made by me. The decision to remove the board of Northland was made by me. On the other hand, I did not make the decision about the process to be used for the review of the School Act, or rather, the process being used now is not the way I thought it should be done when I was there.

Personally I liked both the deputies who served with me. Ours was not a relationship we took home with us, but when we travelled, we spent a lot of time together and we would socialize. I enjoyed the company of both men. Sometimes we had real arguments and yet, when a decision was made, it was implemented.

My relationship with Reno was quite a changeable relationship, and for both of us, it had the elements of a chameleon. Sometimes it was for self-defence and sometimes to gain an advantage. We both recognized that he was going to be around a lot longer as deputy than I was going to be as minister of education. I recognize that and suggest that perhaps some things did not get done while I was minister because he may have decided in his own mind that there was an advantage in waiting. But it is equally true that I decided that I had other things that had a higher priority and I was giving them attention instead.

In terms of my relationship with other staff of the department, I was in the habit of having bag lunches with the clerical and technical staff once or twice a year, at which managers were not allowed. This caused a fair amount of difficulty, because managers, no matter at what level, never felt comfortable with the idea that the minister was talking to their secretaries, file clerks and mail room people.

Most managers below the associate deputy ministers and some directors did not expect to see the minister, unless a matter particularly touched on their branch.

One of the best ways of getting really good information and advice from one's department is to demonstrate from day one that you have other pipelines of information and, that if they don't give you everything that is pertinent and don't give you good, frank professional judgments about what is going on, you are nevertheless going to get it from somewhere else. I think I usually got the bad news with the good because the department knew I was getting information by listening to a lot of other people and that, if they weren't forthcoming, I would know anyway and wonder why they did not tell me.

Propositions

To summarize this section, the following propositions about the role of minister of education in the Department of Education dimension have been formulated.

FORMALLY PRESCRIBED REQUIREMENTS:

49. The minister of education must preside over the Department of Education.

50. The minister is responsible for the activities of the Department of Education and must provide policy direction and political leadership.

51. The minister must personally attend to the "shall" provisions specified in legislation dealing with education in Alberta. These mandatory provisions are found principally in the *Department of Education Act* and the *School Act.*

52. The minister of education may delegate certain authority of the minister to other persons or agencies.

53. The minister of education has a great many discretionary powers, most of which are specified in legislation, including the authority to make regulations and the power to invoke ministerial orders.

INFORMAL EXPECTATIONS:

54. The minister of education is expected to defend the department's programs and staff, to provide leadership, and to be positive about education.

55. The minister is expected to articulate the government's education agenda to the Department of Education.

56. The minister is expected by the Department of Education to act as the department's chief spokesman.

57. Only the deputy minister expects to have direct access to the minister.

ROLE BEHAVIOR:

58. The degree of delegation of responsibility and authority to the deputy minister and others depends on the individual style and priorities of the minister of education.

59. The minister is directly involved in the selection of the deputy minister of education, but the final decision is made by the Cabinet.

60. The degree and kind of involvement of the minister with departmental staff are matters of individual style and behavior.

PUBLIC DIMENSION

The public dimension of the role of minister of education involves the activites of the minister in relation to teachers, school trustees, the general public (including parents and students), and the mass media.

Formally Prescribed Requirements

Formal requirements of the minister's role in the public dimension, unlike the Legislature or Department of Education dimensions, are not found in statutes, regulations, or rules, but exist in tradition, custom, and common practice. For this dimension, the participants were asked what they perceived were the formal demands and requirements placed on the minister of education by the various publics.

What were the formal functions of the minister of education in relation to teachers and The Alberta Teachers' Association?

HYNDMAN There is the responsibility to get into classrooms and staffrooms and meet the teachers where they work. With regard to the ATA, it meant meeting with the senior officials periodically, attending its Annual Representative Assembly, and meeting with the table officers when a brief was presented. I met with some of the ATA subgroups on particular issues, like the Early Childhood Specialist Council.

KOZIAK My functions were to present a state of the union address at their annual meeting, which included announcements on new policy or funding; to receive and respond to the briefs of the ATA; and to be available to discuss any concerns that they had about government policy, legislation or the activities of the Department of Education. The president of the ATA had formal access to the minister.

KING My formal responsibilities were to go to the Annual Representative Assembly of the ATA; to meet regularly with the president and the table officers; to be accessible to the president of the ATA; and to protect the traditional participation of the ATA in educational institutions like the curriculum coordinating board. I was expected to honor traditions.

What were the formal functions of the minister of education in relation to school boards and The Alberta School Trustees' Association?

HYNDMAN The minister attends the annual ASTA meetings and meets with its executive to hear briefs. I could not meet with all the school boards but I was available on the phone to school board chairmen. There were some unique problems in the major cities so, relatively speaking, I had more contact with them.

KOZIAK I presented an annual state of the union address at their November conventions where I made major announcements on education policy and on education grants for the upcoming year. There was also a formal requirement to receive and respond to the briefs of the ASTA. As with the ATA, it meant being available to discuss any concerns. The president had access to me, and I was available to the individual school boards, through their chairmen.

KING My responsibilities were to attend the ASTA's annual meetings, meet with the table officers, and be accessible to the president. I was expected to do all the traditional things and respect their role in the educational system.

What were the formal functions of the minister of education in relation to other interest groups?

HYNDMAN I maintained some formal contact with the home and school groups. There was also a responsibility to attend the Conference of Alberta School Superintendents (CASS) meetings every so often.

KOZIAK The Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association (ACSTA) and the Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations (AFHSA) had formal access to the minister through their presidents, in a similar way to the ATA and the ASTA.

KING To a certain extent the other interest groups were treated like the ATA and the ASTA.

What were the formal functions of the minister of education in relation to the general public?

HYNDMAN I'd get representations from my constituency and from the general public, and I had a responsibility to listen to them. It is not set out in legislation that I had to talk to these groups or the general public, but it is part of the accepted custom and tradition and a

necessary dimension of being a minister. To be effective and to provide leadership I had to hear what other people were saying and be available to rub elbows with everybody. The ATA might have felt uncomfortable that I went to visit teachers in Rimbey rather than only hearing the voice of teachers through the annual resolutions, but it was essential that I had contact with teachers all over the province at all levels. It gave me a feeling as to what was happening on the front line, a feeling I thought the minister should have.

KOZIAK I was personally responsible for responding to their concerns, whether they came directly to me as minister, or to other members of the Legislature who would send on a letter for response. This was true, except where I sat in final judgment on an appeal, in which case I might have the deputy minister respond in the first instance so as not to prejudice the case. Where the information requested was very technical, either the deputy responded or I asked for a draft from the department which I could send, over my signature.

KING The general public does not have any formal expectations of the minister beyond that described in legislation.

What were the formal functions of the minister of education in relation to the mass media?

HYNDMAN To communicate the government's policies and positions and to get the message across.

KOZIAK There wasn't really an obligation. I had to provide them with information or tell them where they could get the information. The media are part of the public, so I wanted to explain any changes in policy, directions, funding patterns and to respond to concerns that the media brought forward.

KING To be accessible to the media any time they wanted, under any conditions. It seemed to be a given that I would talk to them on any subject, on their premise that, at that moment, their topic was the most important thing in the world, even though it might not be in twenty minutes.

Informal Expectations

The participants were asked what they thought various members of the public expected the minister of education to do.

In addition to the formal requirements, what did you perceive was expected of you by teachers and The Alberta Teachers' Association? Trustees and the Alberta School Trustees' Association?

HYNDMAN I think that they all hoped that I would be persuaded by the validity of all their arguments. They expected that I would be accessible, that I would do my homework, and that I would consult other groups. They knew that I would eventually balance all the various opinions and positions in coming to a decision. They expected that I would do this as objectively as possible after carefully weighing all the interests, realizing that no one interest would frequently prevail.

Defining the public interest is the art of politics. It rarely involves implementing what one specific group of society wants, it is usually an amalgam of all opinions. The education system is for students and citizens. It is for future generations. It involves the crucial act of teaching and it is administered by school boards. The interests and goals of all five groups have to be achieved by the minister. Whenever I met with the members of a group, they hoped that I would get back to them in two or three days with a favourable decision.

Each group expected me to be sympathetic, to genuinely respect their suggestions, and if I rejected them, to give reasons for my decision. They also expected that I'd fight for education at the Cabinet table, especially during budget preparation. Some zealot groups on the fringe would expect me to choose their way or no way, but I did not have to deal with them very often.

KOZIAK They expected the minister to increase funding, to provide curriculum materials, and to involve them in decision-making. During my term we had a lot of teachers working on our committees developing curriculum. The ATA expected that it would have representatives sitting on bodies that might make recommendations to the minister. They expected the minister to be the spokesman for education and to be a sympathetic listener to their concerns.

The ATA and teachers had different expectations of the minister. The ATA would be locked into a position as a result of its policy and presentations, whereas individual teachers were much more flexible. The ATA, having set forth a particular position, would

pursue it until it was accepted. An individual teacher would be prepared to make a decision on the basis of whether or not the direction was good or bad. In discussion a teacher might be convinced one way or another. The collective judgment of a group like the ATA is fixed, whereas the view of an individual teacher is affected by the circumstances he or she meets every day. This is the same in any organization.

The ATA was sometimes in conflict with the ASTA; the ATA would tell the minister to do one thing and the ASTA would tell him to do the opposite. I was to judge between two conflicting claims. On the one hand, the trustees said, "We are responsible, we are elected, we are the managers, we have to make the decisions and you as the minister are legislating that decision-making power away from us." On the other hand, the teachers were saying, "We are a professional organization and, as a profession, we should determine who is or is not qualified to teach.". Both groups would have appreciated a minister who would go four-square with their position, but, in the final analysis, I think they were more concerned that the status quo was maintained, that the minister would not fall into one camp or the other.

The link between school boards and the ASTA was never as strong as that between the ATA and teachers. The Calgary Public School Board was not prepared to be on the same level as the Acadia School Division when it came to accepting the will of the ASTA. Calgary Public was the largest school board in the province, teaching over one quarter of the students in the province. It was a pretty strong spokesman, and its chairman, expected direct access to the minister.

KING They expected the minister to be the defender of the education system. Each of the major groups tends to expect the minister to recognize it as the single most important group in education. They expect the minister to communicate the authority and the legitimacy of their position to other groups who, they think, are simply not sensitive or appreciative. In a perfect world, the ATA would like to see the minister explain to the ASTA that teachers are the most important part of the equation, and the ASTA would like the minister to explain to the ATA that trustees are the most important part of the equation because they represent the parents and the population in general.

Quite clearly the ATA's expectations were different from those of individual teachers. I tend to think that if there were an effective way of surveying every teacher in the province, one would find that, on a lot issues, the aggregate view of teachers would be quite different from the view represented by the ATA. As with the teachers and the ATA, I think the composite picture of the views of 1,000 surveyed trustees would be quite different than the picture presented by the ASTA.

In addition to the formal requirements, what did you perceive was expected of you by other interest groups?

HYNDMAN I tried to keep in touch with the numerous home and school groups, but it was difficult.

MLAs expected to meet with me to discuss the information and suggestions they received from the general public and the interest groups in their areas. I'd also get representations from municipalities who felt that it was unfair that they had to collect money for the school boards when they had no say over costs and yet had to take all the blame for higher taxes. Business folk would also come to give me their views on education and the system's graduates.

KOZIAK Various handicapped organizations (like the Winnifred Stewart School group) had regular meetings with the minister. The Association of Independent Schools in Alberta and the ACCESS corporation also had access. Other groups like the Chamber of Commerce and the Legion would often include segments on education in their briefs to me and other ministers.

KING Groups such as the AFHSA did not have their own legislation, but they expected that they would have access to me and that I'd attend their annual meetings if I could. In a certain sense I treated all these other interest groups as a package. Then there were groups like CASS, the ACSTA, and the special education groups that formed a second level. They wanted to meet with me, too.

In addition to the formal requirements, what did you perceive was expected of you by the general public?

HYNDMAN See above.

KOZIAK Literacy! The general public expected that the school would do the job that it was paid to do, and that the minister would make sure that happened. Literacy, numeracy, competency, and the measurement of achievement. We were in a trough after the government got rid of compulsory departmental examinations. The pendulum had swung and, because of public concerns about the basics, we began, with direction and purpose, to investigate what students should be learning in school and we initiated studies on the whole matter of measuring achievement.

These studies were an effective way to meet immediate expectations for a return to compulsory exams, because they allowed us to postpone any action until we were sure which way to go. We also started the achievement examinations in high school in order to measure how students were doing across the province, from year to year, and from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. This was to give us some idea of how we were doing, not as a way to compare individual students.

On this and other problems, I'd make sure that all the major groups were represented and had a say in the process. It was a good opportunity to get them on-side with a decision that had to be made. If they were part of the process, the program would be easier to implement. There is an old saying in education, "No matter how good the program, if the people are not behind it, it can't be implemented; and no matter how bad it is, if the people are behind it, they can implement it."

KING They expect the minister to agree with every criticism they make of education, to confirm the legitimacy of their criticism, and to remedy the problem, while at the same time assuring them that the system is a good one and that their children will not come to harm. The public are pretty schizophrenic about education. On one hand, parents are absolutely convinced that Johnny can't read or add as well as they could, but on the other, their kids are in school, and they are pretty proud of them. In the long run, they want assurance that their kids are well taken care of.

In addition to the formal requirements, what did you perceive was expected of you by the mass media?

HYNDMAN The media expected that I would fall on my face and make mistakes. They expected that I would tell them when things were going wrong and when I had troubles and controversy. They expected me to be available.

KOZIAK It is difficult to lump all the mass media together, but having personally had six months in the media (radio talk show host in St. Albert, spring and summer of 1987), I now appreciate that they all have a job to do. They have to write a story and find an angle. Most often, they just want to report what's happening to the public. The media do not want to have the rug pulled out from under them so, when they write a story, they want to be as accurate as they can and they want a minister to give them good information. They did not expect me to know everything about education.

KING The media expected that I would always tell them everything I knew about the subject in question. They also assumed that I was probably hiding something.

Role Behavior

The participants were asked to describe their relationship with the public and to offer their perceptions about the degree of influence various groups have on the minister of education and on other members of the government.

How would you describe your relationship with the various groups in the public dimension?

HYNDMAN I'd like to talk about all the groups together because I basically tried to use the same strategy with all of them. To get both sides of the story, you would have to ask each of them what their relationship with me was like.

I was not able to do all the things they wanted me to do, but I got a great deal of very valuable advice from teachers and from trustees. I felt a degree of collegiality with both groups. I could be candid in exploring alternatives and policies with them and could ask them informally what they thought of something before it needed to be done. I respected the personalities, and I think there was an unquestioned loyalty to education in their numbers. I did not see them as antagonists whom I had to fight with but rather as people who were crucial parts of the system. We had to communicate, work together, and form a partnership. I tried to avoid the "we-they" approach.

Funding was always an issue because, though one can never spend enough money on education, we are all constrained by how much is available, so we have to make choices. I liked to say, "If you'll help me that's what I'd like, but, if you won't, I have to make the choices anyway because I'm the minister and I'll make them on the basis of the best information from all of your submissions." Sometimes I knew that, from the groups' perspective, it was better politically that I made the decision and I could understand that. However, we'll have a better education system if we all try to work together to understand each others' positions and make a good system even better.

I preferred working together and made it one of my goals to establish that kind of approach. Generally, it worked. I had a few battles with a Calgary school board on occasion, but generally I worked very well with all the interest groups.

The idea of getting all the groups to consider more than one option, to look at all the angles, was important. It worked on the matter of the extended practicum and on increasing the length of the Bachelor of Education degree from three years to four years.

KOZIAK By and large, my relations with all the groups was good. I had a proper relationship with all of them. I may have had the most problem with the ATA because it was the most unhappy about the reduction in the rate of growth in funding that I had to implement. I could never satisfy everybody, but I was never pelted with eggs.

The briefs from all the groups were good sources of information. Teachers provided a lot of assistance to the department particularly on curriculum committees.

The biggest mistake that a minister can make is to leave the impression that he or she knows everything. Such a person immediately becomes a target, and the public says "Let's see what he doesn't know!" I tried to be honest with them and tell them I didn't know but that I'd get back to them with the answers.

KING I did not have a good relationship with the ATA, and that is one of the things that I will regret about being minister of education--regret for a long, long time. But I still think I was right and they were wrong. Teachers are doing the community's most important work. Teaching is the one job which is the essential foundation of community. For this reason, teachers should be enthusiastic and self-confident. They should be served by an enthusiastic and self-confident organization. Alberta's teachers are not well served by the ATA.

One of the other things that I regret now is that I was sometimes too pedantic, that I came across as lecturing or teaching. I don't know what I might have done about it because that is part of my nature, but I think that it had an effect on all of my relationships with these groups. I don't think they understood how much I was prepared to be imaginative. They missed opportunities to a greater or lesser extent because they did not recognize that I loved imagination.

In your estimation, how much influence did the various interest groups have on you as minister?

HYNDMAN In general, I think it was significant. The provincial and local ATA groups, individual teachers, superintendents, principals, the ASTA and its regional groups, school board chairmen, and trustees would all lobby in the best sense of the word. In addition, there were all the reeves, mayors, and everyone else who had an opinion about education.

I think they had a significant involvement. These major interest groups had a special expertise and stake in the process.

The influence of the MLAs who had assessed their ridings was also very important for me to hear. The people who had graduated from the system, parents, employers who were hiring young people from the schools, and taxpayers who were paying the bill were important voices to be heard.

KOZIAK They had a substantial influence on me. I valued the advice I received from them. In education, the minister is dealing with a different situation than in any other portfolio because he speaks for the delivery of a service which is very important to everyone in society. For example, the minister of municipal affairs is not expected to be a spokesman for roads or garbage pickup. But the minister of education is responsible for what goes on in classrooms and is expected to be the spokesman. There is a close relationship among all the people who are involved in the delivery of the service, closer than in other portfolios, so what they each say and do is more important.

Ranking the influence of the various groups would be unfair and unrealistic. Overall, the influence of the interest groups was significant and depended on the issue and the circumstances.

KING I'd say the ATA had the greatest influence on me. Ultimately, it was a negative influence, but certainly it had the greatest influence.

What degree of influence was evident on other members of the government?

HYNDMAN I think that the interest groups had a significant influence on other MLAs. They did a pretty good job of that at the various dinners and functions and at meetings where they presented briefs or submissions. For example, there would be a concerted, organized plan, properly so, to get individual MLAs out to meetings, to have lunch with them, and to tell them about problems. The groups knew that the MLAs opinions would be relayed to Caucus and to me, and they used the MLAs to make sure that they were being heard. Quite frequently, I'd hear from the MLAs that one or more of the groups had been in touch with them on the same issue. The MLAs would say, "There is an issue developing down here and we need to do something about it." It could be busing, curriculum, school buildings, rural school funding, or anything else.

KOZIAK The public would raise the issues of competency, student achievement, the lack of history, the old social studies concept, or values education with the other MLAs who would approach me about the concerns. School boards would make their own presentations to their own MLAs. All the organizations would use their relationship with MLAs to their advantage. They knew that if the minister was going to pass legislation or the education estimates, he needed the support of the Caucus and the Legislature. The interest groups knew that they had an effect. These influences were felt by the minister and sometimes it was very helpful. The minister needs the support of other MLAs in Caucus on legislative matters and if they are informed about the problems in advance, the minister is able to lay out the possible solutions and involve them in the decision-making process. It was particularly helpful if the interest groups were on side already.

KING The ATA had the greatest influence on other members of government, but it manifested itself in ways that ultimately were disfunctional. Rightly or wrongly, perhaps because MLAs heard it from the minister or from teachers in their own constituency, there was a massive feeling in the government that the ATA did not represent the views of teachers. On occasion, the ATA could demonstrate extensive support from teachers and it might be quite a phenomenon in the short run, but basically I believe that government members thought the support was very shallow.

The last four years that I was in the government, and likely before that, teachers were the largest single group in the Caucus. Thus there were13 people with teaching certificates who were talking to their colleagues about the ATA and about what teachers believed. I think that this had some influence on the rest of the government as well.

Summary

The public dimension of the role of minister of education encompasses the interaction of the minister with a wide array of significant others beyond the political and bureaucratic confines of the government, the Legislature, and the Department of Education. Relations with interest or pressure groups (both institutional interest groups and single-issue interest groups), with the general public, and with the media are components of this dimension. Contact with individual teachers and school trustees and the general public, including parents and students, is also a fact of life for the minister of education.

Propositions

To summarize the public dimension of the role of minister of education, the following propositions have been formulated.

FORMALLY PRESCRIBED REQUIREMENTS:

61. Tradition and custom dictate the role of the minister of education in the public domain.

62. Traditionally, the minister of education is required to attend the annual general meetings of the ATA and the ASTA and to provide these groups with the opportunity to present their policy and positions on education.

63. It is customary for the minister to respond to submissions made by the various interest groups and to provide formal opportunities for them to make their views known.

64. The minister of education must be accessible to the leaders of the ATA and the ASTA and to a lesser degree to CASS, the AFHSA, and other public interest groups.

65. The minister must be available to the media.

INFORMAL EXPECTATIONS:

66. The minister is expected to support the positions held by all interest groups and individual members of the public and, at the same time, to find ways of reconciling their differences and to play the mediator in disputes.

67. The minister is expected to be a spokesperson for, and defender of, education.

68. The minister is expected to involve interest groups in education decision-making.

69. Individual school board chairmen, trustees, and teachers expect access to the minister.

70. The public expects the minister to ensure that schools are providing the best education possible.

71. The media expect the minister to give them complete, accurate information about the state of education.

72. The media expect the minister to make mistakes and hope that they will be there when the mistakes are made.

73. The minister is expected to ensure that children are safe and well cared for at school.

ROLE BEHAVIOR:

74. The way in which a particular minister deals with the public varies depending on the individual occupying the role.

75. The relationship between a minister of education and the various public interest groups is not always smooth.

76. Interest groups and individuals in education have a significant amount of influence on the minister of education and on other members of the government.

PERSONAL DIMENSION

The personal dimension of the role emerged from the data as a distinct dimension. This dimension encompasses the following topics which were explored with the three participants during the interviews:

1. Selection of a minister of education
2. Personal goals and aspirations
3. Leadership style
4. Factors affecting personal options as minister
5. Time demands
6. Influence of significant others
7. Disappointments and achievements

Selection of a Minister of Education

What happens in education in Alberta during any given period is determined in part by the Premier who chooses the individual member of the government to be the minister of education. All three participants in this study were selected for the portfolio by the same Premier, E. Peter Lougheed. The participants were asked why they think they were chosen and what characteristics the Premier was looking for in a minister of education.

Why do you think you were asked by Premier Lougheed to serve as the minister of education?

HYNDMAN I had served as the opposition spokesman for education from 1967 to 1971, and had legislative experience. I also knew that Bob Clark, who had been the education minister in the Socred government and was now the leader of the opposition, would be a tough critic of education in the House. He had a reputation as a competent, able and high profile minister of education, and we needed someone who would be able to take him on. I also expressed an interest in education and thought that we needed to do some specific things in the area of special education. Premier Lougheed tended to choose portfolios for Cabinet ministers that were outside their own field of expertise; that is, he tended toward

having a generalist in charge. It was also important to come in to the portfolio without having any of the various interest groups thinking I was their spokesman.

KOZIAK I suppose Lougheed chose me because he had confidence in me and thought that I could contribute to Cabinet. I had been the chairman of the foreign investment review committee, and he had watched my contributions in Caucus and in the Legislature. When he was choosing people for Cabinet he had political considerations: he had to be sure that he had geographic representation, that different ethnic groups were not overlooked, and so forth. I was active in the Ukrainian community, and he knew my interest in multicultural activities. This was a factor because, in education, we were beginning to recognize the need for other languages of instruction, a concept to which I was committed.

KING Peter Lougheed was personally interested in education, and he knew I was. We had worked together in one relationship or another since 1967, and he knew that some of my views on education and feeling about education were compatible with his. He wanted to see things happen and he wanted a risk-taker in the department at that time. He believed that it was best to have a generalist at the head of a department and to leave the administration to the specialists, an attitude he had for almost all Cabinet appointments.

Personal Goals and Aspirations

Once an individual assumes the office of minister of education, his or her own goals and objectives for the portfolio become a factor in shaping education in the province. These elements are part of the personal dimension of the role.

What goals or aspirations did you set for yourself when you became minister of education?

HYNDMAN I wanted to do things that would reflect the statements and positions we had taken in opposition for four years, to maintain the good things and enhance them. I wanted to ensure that students graduating from the system had an education that was relevant to the seventies and also to what they would be encountering in the labor force later on. I wanted to be fair and to be perceived to be fair. Sensitivity to others was very important.

I wanted to support teachers and strengthen or reinforce the position of school boards as the trustees of the local system and encourage decentralization and local decision-

making. I wanted to encourage parents to get more involved in talking about education. I also wanted to talk to trustees and parents about education.

Early childhood services, special education, and assistance to the handicapped were major goals. We had received a large number of submissions on these three topics while we were in opposition.

KOZIAK I wanted to represent the people and do the best possible job I could for them. Education is one of the most important things a government has to deal with. It was important to look at the goals and aspirations of the people in all parts of the province including parents, teachers, students, and other electors. This is not to say that there were no compromises.

I did not look on education as a personal crusade to change the world but as a responsibility I could discharge. I certainly had personal feeings about education, and these resulted in support for multilingual and multicultural programs and support for private schools. I was a product of the separate school system and I thought that it was important that the existing structure should not have a monopoly on education. I believed not only that the separate system had a constitutional right to exist, but that it served the extremely important purpose of ensuring that the public system did not have a monopoly on education. In the same way, I believe that there is a place for alternative education in private schools. There is a fine line between education and propaganda, and I saw private schools as an escape valve for those people who were unhappy with the education system. If people don't believe in the system, good education will not happen. I saw education as a partnership involving everyone; you've got to have people on-side, and I saw it as my job to promote that cooperation.

KING I was very surprised at the appointment. I am a layman, and, while I had a lot of thoughts about education, I had not considered them as goals within my reach, so I did not have them priorized when I took office. It took three or four months before I was able to feel comfortable with the list I created for myself. There were lots of things I wanted to do, but they were not in any order. The first real chance I got to express them was at the ATA summer conference in Olds in August 1979. My understanding, from word that has come back to me since, was that the presentation was not well received as a communication exercise, even though I was personally received warmly as the new minister.

My goals as I expressed them there, and as I reiterated them later,were premised on the belief that the system was basically very good (in my view, the best system in North America) but that it could be made better. I've always believed this about everything I've

done. No matter how good I think something is, I'm never satisfied. I once saw a book on this topic, related to education, called *Uncritical Lovers : Unloving Critics*. The thesis of the book was that education doesn't need either uncritical lovers or unloving critics, what it needs are "critical lovers," and that's what I tried to be. Unfortunately, those who wanted the minister to be an unrepentent critic thought that I was an "uncritical lover", and those who wanted the minister to be an unthinking apologist for the status quo thought I was an "unloving critic", so there was tension throughout my whole term.

I had five priorities:

1. To enhance the self-confidence of teachers and their status in the community;
2. To create a system that was able to give more individualized attention to students and that was more aware of the individual strengths and weaknesses of students;
3. To increase decentralization of decision-making in education, which meant involving more of the lay community in the process;
4. To ensure there was a logic to the way in which education unfolds, unwraps itself; and
5. To ensure that there were constant feedback mechanisms for education.

Leadership Style

How a minister of education translates personal goals and objectives for education into action and behavior is one way of approaching the notion of style. Even though specific role behavior was explored with the three former ministers in relation to all the other dimensions, they were asked again at the end of the interview to share their perceptions of their overall leadership style.

While you were minister, how would you describe your leadership style?

HYNDMAN I tried to make it collegial, communicative, accessible, objective (in the sense of reviewing all the options possible), incremental, and evolutionary. Those words describe the approach I tried to take.

KOZIAK My style was one of commitment to responsibility. I was in a responsible position and I wanted to discharge that responsibility the best way I could. I wanted to be informed so I could make the proper decisions and be prepared to defend them.

KING Because I wanted to find some things that could be made better, I wanted to be a careful analyst of the system. I wanted to identify the five or six things that I thought would most likely result in improvement, and then I wanted to be as provocative as I could be in order to try and accomplish those things. I don't mean provocative in the rethorical sense only, though that was part of it, but also in the sense of provoking something to happen.

Factors Affecting Personal Options as Minister

There are many freedoms and constraints which the minister of education must take into account when making educational decisions.

What factors most affected your options or choices as minister of education?

HYNDMAN On the negative side they included:

1. The financial aspects, money problems.
2. People want change but they often do not like the effects of change. Once changes are made, people accuse you of changing something for no reason.
3. Trustees always wanted to maintain their local independence and they were very quick to point out anything the provincial government was doing, or apparently doing, to erode that.
4. The ATA, very properly, was always pushing for a greater degree of professionalism on behalf of teachers and better working conditions for its members.
5. My occasional inability to convince others, including the Cabinet and the Caucus, of the necessity for a change in policy.

On the positive side they included:

1. The Premier's support for me as minister of education. He believed in delegation and he was never looking over anybody's shoulder. You ran with the ball. Freedom to set your priorities and to schedule the things you wanted to with the department was very nice to have.
2. The fact that I had a fair degree of freedom to allocate money on education during the time I was minister.

KOZIAK The main factors that guided my decisions were fairness and equity. Other factors included how much money I had to work with, and what the ASTA, the ATA and the AFHSA were likely to say about what I was doing.

KING Negatively, I would say the nature of my relationship with the ATA.

Positively, it included such factors as the economic well-being of the province through most of the time I was minister of education. The second thing was the retirement of my first deputy minister, Earl Hawkesworth, and the opportunity this provided me to be involved in choosing his successor. The third was that we had a very large majority, and I could do a lot of things without worrying about whether I was going to lose a vote in the Assembly. This also meant that, in most ridings, you had a government MLA who would help explain government action and policy. This gave me elbow room.

Time Demands

A major factor in considering any leadership position is time, or the lack of it. As minister of education there are many demands ranging from fulfilling responsibilities as a Cabinet member in the government to supplying information and assistance to a single member of the public.

Please describe the time demands required of the minister of education.

HYNDMAN There was just simply not enough time to do all the things I wanted to do. I had to ration the time I had, particularly while the House was in session. I would have liked to have gone around to all the schools in the province and to have talked to students, teachers, and trustees, but there just was not time. I could have made speeches every night of the week around the province. In addition to these normal duties, there were special problems that arose that took up a great deal of time like, the Northlands situation, a curriculum problem, the private schools, problems in the Calgary Public board. They took time away from new things that I wanted to do, and I had to juggle and balance my schedule continuously. Every parent in the province would have liked to have one half hour with the minister of education, but that is just not feasible. At the same time, however, listening only to the parent organizations might not mean that you hear the voices of all parents either.

KOZIAK There is no end to how much time I could have put in as minister. The responsibilities of minister of education took up more time than all the other duties I had as a member of the government. I did not even always get Sunday off as there was always something to read or prepare for the next week. I was never a crack-of-dawn person, but I was often still in my office after supper.

KING It takes 60 to 75 hours a week. Even if one is totally skilful you can be on the go all the time. Inexorably one gets a little run down as time goes on, and being run down diminishes your effective use of time and resources. That was one of the reasons I had mixed feelings when Premier Getty asked me to be minister of Technology, Research and Telecommunications. Although, in my own mind, I was satisfied that it was time to go, there were all kinds of things I still wanted to accomplish in education.

Significant Influences

Sometimes there are individuals or events that have a particular influence on a person's life, work, and career. The counsel of significant others is sought or remembered when advice is required. Events or lessons learned may be recalled and applied to a new problem or situation. The participants were asked about any significant individuals or events that they felt had helped them in their role as minister of education.

Who or what was most influential in your development as minister of education?

HYNDMAN My own education and experience. When I moved into a portfolio that I knew virtually nothing about, the most important tools I had were my abilities to solve problems, listen, get down to the essentials, and communicate the results of decisions, all things I had learned. So my education, especially at the university, enabled me to be reasonably effective in the portfolio. I had also practiced law for 10 years up to then, and that is very much a problem-solving activity: you've got to find rational solutions, negotiate difficult problems, listen to people, communicate in writing, and communicate orally in front of boards and judges. This was all good training.

KOZIAK I will not name any single individual. As minister I had the most contact with the deputy minister. But to single out one person, might suggest what really isn't true; there were many people within the department and in the various groups who were very helpful.

KING There is no question that it was Wilf Pilkington, followed by my wife, Clare.

Wilf Pilkington was Associate Dean of Education and, though I was never in education, I dated his daughter for two and a half years during which time I got to know Wilf very well. He spent his life inside various educational organizations, so that while he appreciated organizations, he never mistook them as being more important than the job. He never mistook the organization to be the essence of what education was all about. Wilf questioned every decision that had to be made, and the questions were always, "What is going to help this student, or the educational opportunity or situation? Given the nature of the organization, how are we going to accomplish that goal (of helping in the best way)?" Wilf taught me that you should never make the mistake of thinking that the organization is the end in itself. The second thing he taught me was that education is really nothing more or less than the interaction between two people and that, to a certain extent, both are teaching and learning at the same time. He believed that good teachers learn from their students and that good students teach other students. The third thing I learned from him was that if a liberal arts education is not important in the whole scheme of things, then you're not going to have education at all.

Clare taught me that a good teacher is one of the most important influences in the formative years of a child and that a good teacher can be a more important formative influence than parents. She constantly reminds me that all kids, regardless of environment, come into the world excited to learn and if, by the time they are 15 or 20, they have lost that excitement to learn, it is not because they weren't born with it, but because something has happened in their life, which we should try to identify and expunge.

Disappointments and Achievements

The three participants were asked to critically assess their terms as minister of education and provide an evaluation of their own performance in office.

What were your major disappointments as minister of education?

HYNDMAN I would like to have had better communication with the public about the whole system,how it worked,what it achieved, what was happening in our classrooms, the excellence of our students, how able a teaching force we had, and how solid a trustee force we had. We have a good education system in comparison to others in North America, and I was disappointed that I was not able to communicate that fact as well as I would have liked to.

KOZIAK I did not really have a major disappointment. Things always took longer than I thought they should, but I guess that's true for everything we do. Timing and scheduling were always a problem, and things would not always happen when I wanted them to occur. If one creates expectations that are out of sync with everybody else's, disappointment is highly likely. So you just have to find the right time to do certain things. In education the pendulum constantly swings from one group to the other, and if I was not careful about timing decisions properly, the results would be quite different than I expected.

KING My major disappointment was my relationship with the ATA and particularly my failure to get a new Teaching Profession Act. My second was that, in the fall of 1985, I did not remove the board of the Lac La Biche School Division and replace it with an official trustee. We tried walking down the middle of the road there, and I think the result was another year and a half of hardship for teachers and students at the high school and at the other schools in the district.

Considering your achievements as minister of education, of which are you most proud?

HYNDMAN (1.) The new momentum we got going in the area of special education and for handicapped students. The funding for students with learning disabilities and special needs went up significantly and I'm very proud of that. (2.) Being able to set the stage in the early '70s for new directions and new ways of thinking about such things as parent involvement, early childhood education, curriculum change, abolishment of the old departmental examinations (as a necessary prelude to bringing in new measures), and the basics in education. (3.) The whole area of improvements to the teacher preparation practicum. (4.) the development of ACCESS.

KOZIAK (1.) The statement of goals of basic education that was passed by the Legislature. (2.) The Heritage Trust Fund learning resources project. (3.) The funding for disabled children. (4.) The funding of private schools. (5.) Multilingual education. (6.) Improvements in the Northland School Division. (7.) The establishment of funding formulas for education.

KING (1.) COATS, although the jury is still out on it. (2.) The ideas behind the Management Finance Plan. (3.) Community schools and some of the ideas in community education, including alternate educational opportunities. (4.) Some of the developments in special education. (5.) The policy paper on the secondary program of studies. (6.) The reinstitution of departmental exams--although, if they are not careful, I might repudiate that one. I never thought that the exams would last for more than six or seven years. I believe in evaluation. I think we should use the best tools that are available, even if they are imperfect, but that we should always be looking for something better. Given that, I expected that a lot more would have been done by now, including such things as test item banks (we should have test item banks with thousands of good questions in them, accessible to teachers through computers). The diploma exams should have been transitional, but, as with other situations that aggravate me, we've now got something that works reasonably well, and instead of being driven to find something better, people are satisfied with it. The next thing that is going to happen is that we are going to get very sloppy about diploma exams. There are some things that can't be measured with multiple choice or short answer tests, simply in order to save money on marking. (7.) Computers and other things went very well, too, but their success was more a matter of being in the right place at the right time and having an interest.

Summary

The personal dimension of the role of minister of education encompasses the following elements, which were explored with the three participants: selection of a minister of education, personal goals and aspirations, leadership style, factors affecting personal options as minister, time demands, significant influences, disappointments and achievements. The findings in this dimension are left to stand on their own because neither a comparison of similarities and differences among the three participants nor propositions highlighting common elements is appropriate.

SUMMARY

This chapter presented the major findings of the study based on the interviews conducted with three former ministers of education in Alberta who were the primary participants. The findings were organized around six dimensions of the role of minister of education, the government, Legislature, party, Department of Education, public, and personal.dimensions. Significant elements of the role of minister in each dimension were highlighted in a series of 76 propositions. These propositions form the basis of the conclusion of the study discussed in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The first section of this chapter presents an overview of the study. The purpose and perspective for the study are noted. The interpretive framework from the literature review in Chapter II and the research design from Chapter III are outlined. Reference is made to the contextual information presented in Chapter IV. The propositions derived from the data in Chapter V, which constitute the findings of the study, are then drawn together.

Based on these propositions, the second section presents a composite description of the role of minister as the conclusion of the study. The chapter ends with an examination of the practical and methodological implications of the work and a list of suggestions for further research.

SUMMARY

This section summarizes the study in terms of (a) its purpose, (b) the perspective from which the data were viewed, (c) the interpretive framework and research design, (d) its context, (e) the propositions derived from the data.

Purpose of the Study

The study examined the role of minister of education in the province of Alberta by examining five specific problems:

1. What were the salient features of the context within which the ministers of education in Alberta carried out their roles?

2. What were the role requirements of the position of minister of education in Alberta from 1971 to 1986 in terms of:
   a) formal prescription?
   b) informal expectations?

3. How did the minister of education in Alberta translate the role requirements into action?

4. What were the similarities and differences of the role requirements and the role behavior among the three ministers of education who held the position from 1971 to 1986?

5. What composite picture of the role of minister of education emerges?

Perspective

Because the position of provincial minister of education is both political and administrative, each of the specific problems of the study was considered from the perspective of both political and organizational theory. In viewing the role of minister through these two lenses simultaneously, attention was paid to such political activities as governing, legislating, controlling and influencing, while at the same time looking at such administrative activities as planning, organizing, leading, policy-making, implementing, communicating and evaluating. From this starting point and a review of the literature, an interpretive framework and a design for the research were developed.

Interpretive Framework and Research Design

To effectively investigate the role of minister of education and to facilitate the collection of data, an interpretive framework was developed based on six dimensions of the role: the government, Legislature, party, Department of Education, public and personal dimensions. The dimensions were derived from a review of the literature on the workings of government in Canada and from the observations by the researcher of the political process in Alberta. While arbitrary, these dimensions provided a way of managing the data and an opportunity of examining particular aspects that might otherwise have been missed. The interpretive framework and the literature review were presented in Chapter II.

The research design was described in Chapter III. The nature and sources of data used in the study were outlined and ethical considerations and the trustworthiness of the research were emphasized. The process of data collection and analysis was also detailed and focused on interviewing as the principal methodology.

Nature and Sources of Data

Both documentary and interview data were used in this study. These sources produced more than 400 pages of documents, 109 pages of typed transcript of the tape-recorded interviews, and 50 pages of notes taken by the researcher during and after the interviews. The primary participants interviewed for this study were the ministers of education for Alberta who held office from September 10, 1971, to February 6, 1986. They were:

Louis D. Hyndman, September 10, 1971 to April 3, 1975
Julian G. J. Koziak, April 3, 1975 to March 23, 1979
David T. King, March 23, 1979 to February 6, 1986

The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical research guidelines established by the University of Alberta. As the primary participants were all still highly visible in the Alberta community, care was taken to ensure that the results of the study were not harmful or threatening to the participants. Trustworthiness of the data was an important consideration, and special efforts were made to acknowledge, address, and minimize the negative effects of perception and bias.

Process of Data Collection and Analysis

The principal method of data collection for this study was interviews conducted with each of the three former ministers. Two interviews, of approximately one and one half hours, were carried out by the researcher with each of the three former ministers, between September 28 and October 23, 1987. These interviews were tape-recorded, and notes were made by the researcher during and after the sessions. In mid-February, 1988, a telephone interview was conducted with Mr. King to complete a number of questions concerning the party dimension that were not covered in the initial interviews.

The analysis of data was carried out from the perspective of both political and administrative theory as described in Chapter I and within the interpretive framework based

on the six role dimensions developed in Chapter II. An inductive approach was used in examining documents and in collecting and analyzing interview data, thereby allowing one discovery or one response to lead to other avenues of investigation.

Context

As background for interpreting the findings of the study, Chapter IV outlined the main features of the political-legislative, social-economic, and educational context in Alberta. Following an historical review, the context chapter concentrated on the time periods during which the three primary participants held office as minister of education. The periods were characterized by continuous Progressive Conservative government, boom and bust economies, and increasing controversy and debate about education.

Propositions

The findings of this study were presented in Chapter V. From the interview data and the available documentary information, each dimension of the role was explored in terms of the formally prescribed requirements, the informal expectations, and the role behavior of the minister of education. Similarities and differences in requirements, expectations and behavior among the three primary participants were evident in the findings, some of which appeared to be related to the particular context within which each participant functioned while minister. The pervasive and significant elements of the role of minister were summarized for each dimension in the form of general propositions about the role of minister of education. These propositions have been drawn together here to construct a composite picture of the role of minister of education in Alberta as the basis for the conclusion of the study.

While the propositions were derived, in the main, from the perceptions of the three primary participants, they were supplemented by documentary information related to formally prescribed requirements as set out in Alberta statutes and to informal expectations

for ministerial behavior in the government, the Legislative Assembly, and the Department of Education as described in rules and guidelines.

The responsibility for the selection, organization, and presentation of the following propositions lies with the researcher.

Government dimension

The propositions in this first dimension relate to the minister's activities as a member of the Cabinet, Caucus, and committees or task forces of these two bodies, and as a representative of the government outside the province.

FORMALLY PRESCRIBED REQUIREMENTS:

1. The minister of education as a member of the Cabinet is bound to maintain Cabinet solidarity and secrecy.

2. The minister must execute the powers and trusts of the position as stipulated in legislation and regulations.

3. The minister is assumed to be the education expert in Cabinet.

4. The minister of education assumes the primary responsibility for program, policy, financial, and political decisions in education on behalf of the government.

5. The minister is required to publicly disclose personal assets or place them in a blind trust for the duration of the term as minister.

INFORMAL EXPECTATIONS:

6. The minister of education is expected to be an advocate for education.

7. Other members of Cabinet expect the minister to know what the major interest groups think of proposals dealing with education.

8. The minister is to communicate government decisions about education to others in the education community

9. The minister is to act as the government spokesman on education, both within and outside the province.

10. Different ministers of education view the notion of ministerial discretion differently.

11. The minister is to defend the education portion of the budget in Cabinet.

12. The minister is to assist other government MLAs on matters related to education, by providing information and solving education problems in their constituencies.

13. The minister is to be able to convince Caucus of the wisdom of proposed government action on education.

14. The minister is expected to protect provincial jurisdiction over education from the encroachment of the federal government.

15. The minister should work with, but not dominate, the education committee of Caucus.

ROLE BEHAVIOR:

16. Different ministers have different styles of operation.

17. A minister of education's style of operation determines the kind of relationships he or she establishes with Cabinet colleagues and other government MLAs.

18. The power of ministers in Cabinet or Caucus derives from their capacity to persuade their colleagues of the rightness of their arguments.

19. The minister must always be accessible to other government members regarding education matters.

20. The minister must act to ensure that other government MLAs are supportive of positions taken on education.

Legislature dimension

The propositions in the Legislature dimension relate to the minister's activities in the Legislative Assembly, including involvement with other members of the government side of the House, the opposition, the Speaker and the constituents of the minister as MLA.

FORMALLY PRESCRIBED REQUIREMENTS:

21. The minister of education is required to swear faithfulness and allegiance to the Queen.

22. The minister must adhere to the rules of the Legislative Assembly as enunciated by the Speaker.

23. The minister is responsible for presenting to the Legislature new legislation, government policy, and budget estimates for education .

24. Whenever possible the minister must attend the Legislative Assembly while it is in session.

25. In the Legislature the minister is required to answer questions about education posed by other members of the Assembly.

26. The minister must answer to the Legislature for personal actions and for the actions of those employed in the Department of Education, and should resign if a serious error or impropriety is committed that the minister could have prevented.

27. The minister is required to ensure that standards and regulations are in place to guide the behavior of others providing education in Alberta.

INFORMAL EXPECTATIONS:

28. When speaking or voting in the Legislature, the minister of education is expected by the Premier to support the decisions of Cabinet.

29. The minister is expected to show leadership in the Legislature and to anticipate potential difficulties with educational legislation and policy.

30. The opposition expects the minister of education to make mistakes on which it can capitalize politically.

31. The minister is to be the opposition's principal adversary on education matters.

32. The minister is expected by the Speaker to answer questions in the Legislature in a direct manner.

33. The minister is expected to use the Legislature as a forum for providing information to the opposition, the media, and the public.

34. The minister is expected by the Speaker to help maintain order and decorum while in the Assembly.

35. The voters in the minister's constituency have little interest in the Legislature activities of the minister of education.

ROLE BEHAVIOR:

36. Different incumbents translate the role requirements and expectations of the minister of education in the Legislature dimension differently.

37. One of the roles of the minister of education in the Legislature is to keep the political temperature down.

38. The minister of education must demonstrate an open, honest, serious attitude when dealing with education in the Legislature.

39. The minister should be positive about education.

40. The minister of education is expected to be an effective communicator and debater.

Party dimension

The propositions in the party dimension relate to the minister's activities as a member of a political party that forms the government. This dimension encompasses the

minister's involvement party philosophy, policy, and practices including activities at party meetings and with party officials.

FORMALLY PRESCRIBED REQUIREMENTS:

41. The minister of education is required to follow the precepts of the party philosophy and to abide by the party rules and regulations.

42. The minister must attend annual party conventions and policy conferences to answer questions about education from the delegates.

43. The minister is required to report back to the party on government disposition of policy resolutions passed at party conventions.

44. The minister should keep party activities separate from legislative functions.

INFORMAL EXPECTATIONS:

45. The minister of education, as a Cabinet minister, is expected to encourage support for the party whenever appropriate.

46. The minister should assist the party leader to explain government policy to the members.

47. The minister is expected to answer party members' questions about education and to provide advice and assistance to members on educational issues.

ROLE BEHAVIOR:

48. There is potential for the role of minister of education and the role of member of the Legislative Assembly to conflict in terms of time and allegiance.

Department of Education dimension

The propositions in the Department of Education dimension describe the minister's activities in relation to the department in general and to the deputy minister and other staff of the department in particular.

FORMALLY PRESCRIBED REQUIREMENTS:

49. The minister of education must preside over the Department of Education.

50. The minister is responsible for the activities of the Department of Education and must provide policy direction and political leadership.

51. The minister must personally attend to the "shall" provisions specified in legislation dealing with education in Alberta. These mandatory provisions are found principally in the *Department of Education Act* and the *School Act*.

52. The minister of education may delegate certain authority of the minister to other persons or agencies.

53. The minister of education has a great many discretionary powers, most of which are specified in legislation, including the authority to make regulations and the power to invoke ministerial orders.

INFORMAL EXPECTATIONS:

54. The minister of education is expected to defend the department's programs and staff, to provide leadership, and to be positive about education.

55. The minister is expected to articulate the government's education agenda to the Department of Education.

56. The minister is expected by the Department of Education to act as the department's chief spokesman.

57. Only the deputy minister expects to have direct access to the minister.

ROLE BEHAVIOR:

58. The degree of delegation of responsibility and authority to the deputy minister and others depends on the individual style and priorities of the minister of education.

59. The minister is directly involved in the selection of the deputy minister of education, but the final decision is made by the Cabinet.

60. The degree and kind of involvement of the minister with departmental staff are matters of individual style and behavior.

Public dimension

The propositions in the public dimension involve the minister's interaction with a wide array of significant others outside of the government, Legislature, party and departmental arenas. Relations with interest or pressure groups, with the general public, and with the media are components of this dimension.

FORMALLY PRESCRIBED REQUIREMENTS:

61. Tradition and custom dictate the role of the minister of education in the public domain.

62. Traditionally, the minister of education is required to attend the annual general meetings of the ATA and the ASTA and to provide these groups with the opportunity to present their policy and positions on education.

63. It is customary for the minister to respond to submissions made by the various interest groups and to provide formal opportunities for them to make their views known.

64. The minister of education must be accessible to the leaders of the ATA and the ASTA and to a lesser degree to CASS, the AFHSA, and other public interest groups.

65. The minister must be available to the media.

INFORMAL EXPECTATIONS:

66. The minister is expected to support the positions held by all interest groups and individual members of the public and, at the same time, to find ways of reconciling their differences and to play the mediator in disputes.

67. The minister is expected to be a spokesperson for, and defender of, education.

68. The minister is expected to involve interest groups in education decision-making.

69. Individual school board chairmen, trustees, and teachers expect access to the minister.

70. The public expects the minister to ensure that schools are providing the best education possible.

71. The media expect the minister to give them complete, accurate information about the state of education.

72. The media expect the minister to make mistakes and hope that they will be there when the mistakes are made.

73. The minister is expected to ensure that children are safe and well cared for at school.

ROLE BEHAVIOR:

74. The way in which a particular minister deals with the public varies depending on the individual occupying the role.

75. The relationship between a minister of education and the various public interest groups is not always smooth.

76. Interest groups and individuals in education have a significant amount of influence on the minister of education and on other members of the government.

Personal dimension

This final dimension encompass the traits, attributes, goals, and objectives of the person chosen as minister of education. It is the most elusive of all the dimensions but may be the one that has the most impact on the perception of others about what a minister does or is supposed to do. This dimension does not lend itself to consolidation, and neither a comparison of similarities and differences among the three participants nor a presentation of propositions highlighting common elements is appropriate. However, some general observations are possible.

Ministers of education are chosen for the position by the Premier of the province because they meet particular requirements that the Premier believes are necessary for the

person in that role at a particular time. Such factors as previous party experience, expertise, education, political and educational philosophy, style of operation, and compatibility with other members of the Cabinet are considerations in the selection. Other factors such as geographical representation, ethnic background, language, religious affiliation, and sex may also be considered in the selection of a minister of education. Premier Lougheed, who chose each of the ministers in this study, believed in the concept of having generalists as ministers and studiously avoided appointing individuals who had a specialized knowledge about education or a vested interested in the portfolio. This management philosophy was also a determining factor in how ministers of education were selected during the period covered by this study.

Once appointed, the incumbents bring to bear on the position their own goals, objectives, and plans for education. These are tempered by the education issues of the day and may even be put aside as other matters of greater importance and urgency intervene. Nonetheless, this study found that, while not all three ministers articulated or communicated their goals to the same extent or in the same way, each had certain personal objectives that they attempted to accomplish during their term.

Leadership style, as a component of the personal dimension, tends to generate the most accolades and, in some cases, the most controversies and recriminations. Often, the way in which a particular minister addresses and deals with people and with issues in education becomes more important than what is being proposed. Whether particular styles of operation are more effective than others was not the subject of this study and is therefore left to the reader's assessment.

Notwithstanding the impact of style, other factors affect the personal options of the minister of education. The one most frequently mentioned was money. Education is an expensive, human-intensive activity that almost everyone in society agrees deserves considerable financial support. However, it is one of the sectors of government that does not generate capital on its own. While it can be argued that future generations of graduates

will more than repay the expenditures on their formal schooling, education is a net user of taxpayer contributions. Ministers of education are constantly confronted with demands for more funding for education while, at the same time, as members of the Cabinet, they are asked to balance the requirements of all other sectors of society for services and reasonable tax rates. Other factors that influence ministerial choices include the need to be fair and equitable in relation to the various interests in education, the kind of relationships ministers have with the major education interest groups, and the considerable, never ceasing demands on the minister's time.

CONCLUSION

Drawing on the propositions concerning requirements, expectations, and role behavior in each dimension, this section offers a composite description of the role of minister in Alberta as the conclusion of the study.

According to the *Pocket Oxford Dictionary* (1969), a composite description means a representation, depiction, or picture in words consisting of different parts or elements with a view to constructing a united effect, thereby enabling the reader to form an idea about the whole. In considering how best to present a composite description of the role of minister of education, the researcher thought continually about the image of a painting. The analogy was useful in that the study began by gathering ideas together, deciding on the size and scope of the endeavor, selecting materials, determining techniques to be employed, and choosing the subjects who would provide the major outline and color for the final work. Keeping in mind the perspective from which the painting would be viewed, the researcher selected an interpretive frame over which the canvass for the picture could be stretched. In turn, the canvass was prepared and the background (context) was laid down. Because a number of the dimensions of the role had been chosen when the collection and analysis of data began, some of the foreground for the painting was immediately apparent and was sketched in. As more data were gathered, other images of the role began to emerge.

Elements that survived the sifting and sorting process found their way into the propositions. These were subsequently enriched, enlarged, and revised with the addition of the interview data as the outline of the composite picture of the role of minister of education took shape. What remains is to present the findings of the study and complete the painting.

The composite picture that follows is offered in the light of the underlying truth that describing the role of the minister of education in Alberta is a matter of perception. Depending on which side of the desk you are sitting, what beliefs you have about politics or administration, which interest groups you belong to, and in what arena you have occasion to see or talk with the minister, your perception of the role will likely be different than anyone else's. Payne (1987, p. 322) in quoting Merriam suggests that "at all levels of the system, what people *think* they are doing, what they *say* they are doing, what they *appear* to be doing, and what in fact they *are* doing, may be sources of considerable discrepancy." In terms of this study, the role description of the minister of education is further complicated by including what they and others perceive they are *required* to do, and what they are *expected* to do. Just as the perceptions of the primary participants and the researcher have affected the conclusion of this study, so will the perceptions of the readers as they interpret what follows from their own perspectives.

A Composite Description of the Role of Minister of Education in Alberta

As part of the interviews, the former ministers were asked to describe the role of minister of education in a single sentence. While they did not all manage to do so within that strict requirement, their perceptions of what being the minister means are an appropriate starting place for the conclusion of this study.

HYNDMAN It means to provide leadership. This includes not only setting policy, but establishing good relationships with all the other groups in education, being part of a carefully thought out, positive communications plan, being accessible, being available,

consulting on new directions, and implementing policy in such a way that it is evolutionary. It also means fighting for as many dollars for education as possible and persuading Cabinet and Caucus that education is important. These are all dimensions of leadership that are not set forth in the *Department of Education Act*. It is possible just to sit there and "preside," just sign memos and let the system run by itself. To simply preside does not, however, provide leadership.

KOZIAK The role of the minister of education is to be responsible to the Legislature for the educational system and the education of children in the province. While the Legislature has the power with respect to education, it, in turn, has delegated that responsibility to the minister of education. The Legislature regards education as an extremely important aspect of society and holds that individual responsible to see that the job is done. Therefore, subject to the overriding authority of the Legislature, the minister is the person vested with the responsibility for the education of Albertans of school age.

KING It is to be a loving critic of education and to give as much energy as possible to the job of persuading the community of the importance of education and the absolute, fundamental importance of not being satisfied with anything less than the best that is possible.

The role of the minister of education is to operate effectively in the government, Legislature, party, Department of Education, public, and personal dimensions for the good of education. Operating effectively means understanding, translating, and executing the formal requirements of the position. It means interpreting the informal expectations of others, fulfilling those with which you concur, and refusing to execute those with which you do not concur. It means fulfilling the expectations of the Premier who appoints you to head the education portfolio. It also means having personal objectives in mind for education and working towards them in the things you do as minister.

As with other leadership roles, a balancing act is an essential part of the repertoire of the minister of education in any of the dimensions. Whether it is balancing the welfare of education with the needs of the entire province, balancing the expectations of the government with those of the Department of Education, balancing the demands of all your

constituents with those of party members who helped elect you, or balancing the formal requirements of the minister with the informal expectations of the interest groups with which you may or may not agree, the minister is always in the center ring of education.

The position of minister of education is the chief elected position in education and, as such, might be considered as purely political. This study reveals, however, that the minister of education is also involved in the administrative aspects of education and that, in all the dimensions, the line between administration and politics blurs. As a result, it seems more accurate and honest to dispense with the bipolar notion and to describe the role of the minister of education in the 1980s in terms of the integration of politics and administration. Education today is simply too complex to assume that a sharp dividing line between administrative responsibilities and political responsibilities exists or should exist. This has implications for those who aspire to the position of minister of education, those who would be their deputies, and those in Canada who observe the politics and administration of education with a critical eye.

The findings reveal that both in terms of formal requirements and informal expectations, the role of minister of education in Alberta involves leadership, decision-making, goal and direction setting, and policy determination. But it also involves persuading, convincing, endless discussing and consulting, listening, taking advice and direction, weighing options and sensitivities, and compromising. It involves being a dictator, mediator, arbitrator and team player, sometimes all in the same day. All three participants believed that, while the buck stopped at the minister's door, effective solutions usually came about when all the parties involved could agree to some degree with the final educational decision.

In terms of formal requirements, whether described in legislation or understood by tradition, the role of the minister of education in Alberta is to be responsible to the Legislature and to be the government's principal spokesperson for education inside and outside the province. This means that the minister is responsible not only for his or her

own actions and for the decisions of the government but also for those bodies that derive their legitimacy through educational legislation over which the minister presides. While responsible to the Cabinet and to the Legislature, the minister of education is ultimately accountable to the voters of Alberta. As the chief spokesperson, the minister of education must communicate in some way with all of the interests that are encountered in every dimension of the role. How this is accomplished seems to have more to do with personal attributes and style than with any common requirements.

In terms of informal expectations, the demands on the minister are varied and seemingly endless in all dimensions of the role. From the Premier who appoints the minister, to the junior high mathematics teacher in Lac La Biche, to the single parent of a four-year-old in kindergarten in Lethbridge, to the table officers of the Alberta Teachers' Association, all Albertans have expectations of the minister of education. Some common expectations of others, as perceived by the three participants in this study, included ministerial support and sympathy for diverse positions on education; extensive knowledge about education; immediate response to questions and inquiries; acknowledgment of the legitimate role of certain of the interest groups; fairness, justice and honesty; a demonstrable advocacy for education; and a commitment to the best interest of children.

In terms of role behavior, the minister of education should be a good communicator and listener and be willing to hear all sides of an educational issue. The participants all believed that the minister needed to be accessible and approachable, albeit to greater or lesser degrees, depending on the audience. The minister ought to be empathetic to a wide variety of interest groups and individuals and be particularly sympathetic to those directly involved in providing public education. The minister is expected to be open and forthright with the media and the opposition in the Legislature but is also expected to maintain Cabinet secrecy and solidarity even when personal beliefs conflict with those of the majority of Caucus. Displaying all of these attributes at any given time is seldom possible, and all three former ministers acknowledged that their particular styles of operation sometimes did

not please everyone. Role behavior and personal style as minister can be the source of the greatest sense of accomplishment, but, as the findings revealed, they can also be the source of the greatest disappointments. How incumbents play out the role in the personal dimension may be the most important factor in determining what they are able to do in the portfolio and, ultimately, how they are perceived as ministers of education in Alberta.

IMPLICATIONS

This chapter ends with an examination of the practical and methodological implications of the study and offers some suggestions for further research.

Practical Implications

In practical terms, the study was intended to contribute to the literature on educational governance, particularly as it relates to Alberta in the 1970s and 1980s. This was accomplished by providing a brief historical perspective and then concentrating on the educational activities of the government and three ministers of education between 1971 and 1986. Second, the study has added to the knowledge about the position of minister of education in Alberta which may help the reader better understand the role as it is played out by others in the present and the future. It may also be of interest to those who aspire to the position. Third, insights have been offered about the practical workings of government as they relate to education in the province of Alberta, thereby, it is hoped, providing assistance to educators and others in the community who have occasion to interact with the office of the minister of education.

Methodological Implications

Despite its limitations, the research design used for the study offers a replicable framework within which other political leaders in education and in other fields can be studied. Separating a complex activity such as the position of minister into dimensions has the advantage of allowing the researcher to concentrate on specific functions and elements

of the role. Viewing the role of an elected position from both the political and administrative perspectives allows the interrelationship of two bodies of theory to emerge in the findings. The effort required to gather information, particularly in the political arena, is time consuming, and the use of interviews as the primary source of data can be frustrating, but these approaches add to the richness of the work. In the final analysis, the usefulness of this particular design for exploring roles will be determined by others who may see fit to apply it to their own studies.

Suggestions for Further Research

This study could be extended to other persons who have occupied or are currently occupying the role of minister of education in Alberta. Nor do such studies need to be restricted to Alberta. Expanding the net to other Canadian provinces is worthy of consideration. Moving beyond education, the design developed in this study could be used to explore the roles of ministers in other portfolios.

An obvious gap in this study was the failure to examine the perceptions of significant others about their informal expectations of the minister of education. Studies of the expectations of interest groups, members of the Legislative Assembly (both government and opposition), the public, and the media would be starting places to fill this void.

One could also consider the low-level propositions which emerged from the findings as hypotheses to be tested, validated and expanded to higher levels of specification.

This work may also encourage research on other aspects of politics and education in Alberta and Canada, an area of study requiring more attention.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberta Department of Education. (1907). *Annual report of the department of education of the province of Alberta for 1905/6*. Edmonton, AB: Government Printer.

Alberta Department of Education. (1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987). *Annual reports of the department of education of the province of Alberta for 1971 to 1986*. Edmonton, AB: Government Printer.

Alberta Department of Education. (1985). *Partners in education: principles for a new school act*. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Alberta Department of Education. (1987). Expenditures on education by Alberta school boards 1961-1985. Edmonton, AB: Finance and Administrative Services Branch, Author.

Alberta Department of Education. (1987). *Historical comparison of sources of funds for school boards*. Edmonton, AB: Finance and Administrative Services Branch, Author.

Alberta Manpower. (1986). *Immigration to Alberta, overview for 1981 to 1985*. Edmonton, AB: Government of Alberta.

Alberta Teachers' Association. (1986). *A guide to Alberta's twenty-first legislature*. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Almond, G. A., & Powell, G. B. (1978). *Comparative politics*. Boston: Little Brown.

Archer, M. S. (1985). Educational politics, a model for their analysis. In I. May , & J. Ozga (Eds.), *Policy making in education, the breakdown of consensus* (pp. 39-64). Toronto: Pergamon Press in Association with the Open University.

Bergen, J. J. (1979). The interprovincial coucil of ministers of education. *MAST*, 6(2), 25-27. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba Association of School Trustees.

Black, E. R. (1982). *Politics and the news*. Toronto, ON:Butterworths.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). *Educational research, an introduction* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Chalmers, J. W. (1967). *Schools of the foothills province: the story of public education in Alberta*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Christian, W. (1985). Party system. In J. W. Marsh (Ed.), *Canadian encyclopedia* (pp. 1368-70). Edmonton, AB: Hurtig.

d'Aquino, T. (1984). Political neutrality is right. *Policy Options*, January, 23-26.

Dahl, R. A. (Ed.) (1984). *Modern political analysis*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics. (1967-). *The organization and adminstration of public schools in Canada (4th ed.)*. Ottawa, ON: Queen's Printer.

Employment and Immigration Canada. (1978). *Population information kit*. Ottawa, ON: Supply and Services Canada.

Engelmann, F. C. (1987). *The Alberta legislative system*. Unpublished paper, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Farran, R. (1987). *Practical insights into the workings of government*. A series of presentations made in the course political science 421 taken by the researcher from January to April, 1987 at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Government of Alberta. (1908). An act to grant certain powers to the minister of education. *Revised statutes of Alberta*, chapter 13. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Government of Alberta. (1910). An act to amend the school ordinance, the school assessment ordenance, and the school grants ordinance. *Revised statutes of Alberta*, chapter 6. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Government of Alberta. (1914). An act to amend chapter 13 of the statutes of 1908. *Revised statutes of Alberta*, chapter 14. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Government of Alberta. (1922). An act respecting the department of education. *Revised statutes of Alberta*, vol. 1, chapter 16. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Government of Alberta. (1970). The department of education act. *Revised statutes of Alberta*, chapter 96. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Government of Alberta. (1972). The department of education amendment act. *Revised statutes of Alberta*, chapter 31. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Government of Alberta. (1972 to 1985). *Throne speeches to the Alberta Legislative Assembly*. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Government of Alberta. (1980). Department of education act. *Revised statutes of Alberta*, chapter D-17. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Government of Alberta. (1980). The school act. *Revised statutes of Alberta*, chapter S-3. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Government of Alberta. (1985). *Proposals for an industrial and science strategy for Albertans, 1985 - 1990*. Edmonton, AB: Author.

Government of Alberta. (1987). *Budgetary expenditure by government department, operating and capital*. Edmonton, AB: Alberta Public Accounts, Author.

Gross, N., Mason, W. S., & McEachern, A. W. (1958). *Explorations in role analysis: studies of the school superintendency role*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1982). Epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 30(4), 233-252.

Hansen, E. J. (1985). *Statistical handbook for economic consultants* (rev. ed.). Edmonton, AB: The Alberta Teachers' Association.

Hehner, E. (1985). Growth of discretions -- decline of accountability. In K. Kernaghan (Ed.), *Public administration in Canada, selected readings* (5th ed., pp. 341-350). Toronto: Methuen.

Hockin, T. A. (Ed.). (1979). *The prime minister and political leadership in Canada* (2nd ed.). Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall.

Hodgetts, J. E. (1985a). Cabinet. In J. H. Marsh (Ed.), *The Canadian encyclopedia* (p. 251). Edmonton, AB: Hurtig.

Hodgetts, J. E. (1985b). Challenge and response: a retrospective view of the public service of Canada. In K. Kernaghan (Ed.), *Public administration in Canada, selected readings* (5th ed., pp. 88-100). Toronto: Methuen.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1982). *Educational administration, theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.

Hyndman, L. D. (1972, April 7). Second reading of bill 19, the department of education amendment act , speech to the Alberta Legislative Assembly. *Alberta Hansard* (pp. 24.32-37). Edmonton: Queens Printers.

Johnson, A. W. (1985). The role of the deputy minister. In K. Kernaghan (Ed.), *Public administration in Canada, selected readings* (5th ed., pp. 289-298). Toronto: Methuen.

Johnson, N. A. (1987). The pervasive, persuasive power of perceptions. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 33(3), 206-228.

Kernaghan, K. (Ed.). (1985). *Public administration in Canada, selected readings* (5th ed.). Toronto: Methuen.

Krawchenko, K. E. (1984). *Politics in educational policy-making: a study of educational discourse in the Alberta Legislative Assembly 1976-1984*. Unpublished colloquium for a master's degree in secondary education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Leitch, M. (1987). *Practical insights into the workings of government*. A series of presentations made in the course political science 421 taken by the researcher from January to April, 1987 at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lougheed, E. P. (1971a, September 7). *Memo to government progressive conservative MLAs*. Edmonton, AB: Alberta Provincial Archives Accession No.78.57/42.

Lougheed, E. P. (1971b, September 10). *News release announcing the new Alberta cabinet*. Edmonton, AB: Office of the Premier.

Lougheed, E. P. (1973, May 2). Public disclosure of interest, statement to the Alberta Legislative Assembly. *Alberta Hansard* (pp. 51.2739-2740). Edmonton, AB: Queens Printers.

Lougheed, E. P. (1975, May 22). *News release regarding the establishment of caucus committees*. Edmonton, AB: Office of the Premier. Legislative library reference no. CA2ALPM 75S76.

Lougheed, E.P. (1979, May 14). *Announcement regarding the reestablishment of a number of standing committees and special caucus committtees.* Edmonton, AB: Office of the Premier. Legislative Library Reference No. CA2ALPM 79S77.

Lougheed, E.P. (1987). *Practical insights into the workings of government.* A series of presentations made in the course political science 421 taken by the researcher from January to April, 1987 at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Lundberg, G. A., Schrag, C. C., Larsen, O. N., & Catton, W. R.(Jr). (1968). *Sociology* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

MacDonald, F. I. (1980). The minister and the mandarins. *Policy Options*, 1(3), Sept/Oct, 29-31.

Marzolf, A. D. (1961). *Alexander Cameron Rutherford and his influence on Alberta's educational program.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Matheson, W. A. (1985). The cabinet and the Canadian bureaucracy. In K. Kernaghan (Ed.), *Public administration in Canada, selected readings* (5th ed., pp. 266-280). Toronto: Methuen.

Measor, L. (1985). Interviewing: a strategy in qualitative research. In Burgess, R. G. (Ed.), *Strategies of educational research: qualitative methods* (pp. 55-77). Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Michelmann, H. J., & Steeves, J. S. (1985). The 1982 transition of power in Saskatchewan: the PCs and the public service. *Canadian Public Administration*, 28(1), 1-23.

Oviatt, B. C. (1971). *The papers of William Aberhart as minister of education, 1935-1943*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Owens, R. G. (1982). Methodological rigor in naturalistic inquiry: some issues and answers. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 18(2), 1-21.

Paltiel, K. Z. (1982). The changing environment and role of special interest groups. *Canadian Public Administration*, 25(2), 198-210.

Parliamentary Counsel Office (1986, June). *Members' guide*, Legislative Assembly of Alberta. Edmonton, AB.

Payne, C. H. (1987). *Parents and control of elementary school principal work behavior.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

Pocket Oxford Dictionary (5th ed.). (1969). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Progressive Conservative Association of Alberta. (1978 to 1982). *Resolutions booklets.* Edmonton, AB: Author.

Progressive Conservative Association of Alberta. (1980). *History of the progressive conservative party of Alberta..* Edmonton, AB: Author.

Progressive Conservative Association of Alberta. (1982). *Progressive conservative party of Alberta handbook.* Edmonton, AB: Author.

Province of Alberta. (1972). *A choice of futures: report of the commission on educational planning.* Edmonton, AB: Author.

Punnett, R. M. (1977). *The prime minister in Canadian government and politics.* Toronto, ON: Macmillan.

Robinson, N., Cree, J., & Giles, V. M. E. (1988, June). *The experience of being minister of education.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration, Windsor, ON.

Rousseau, J. G.(Jr). (1968). *Some aspects of the role of selected deputy ministers of education.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Ruff, N. J. (1985). Provincial government. In J. H. Marsh (Ed.), *The Canadian encyclopedia* (pp. 1499-1501). Edmonton, AB: Hurtig.

Savoie, D. J. (1983). The minister's staff: the need for reform. *Canadian Public Administration*, 26(4), 509-524.

Self, P. (1977). *Administrative theories and politics: an enquiry into the structure and processes of modern government.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Sergiovanni, T. J., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F. D., & Thruston, P. W. (1980). *Educational governance and administration.* New Jersey: Prentice.

Sharpe, M. (1982). A reply from a former minister and mandarin. In P. Fox (Ed.), *Politics: Canada* (5th ed., pp.476-479). Toronto, ON: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Smiley, D. V. (1980). *Canada in question, federalism in the eighties* (3rd ed.). Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Statistics Canada. (1979). *Canada's population & Canadian families, series for the 1976 census of Canada*. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Statistics Canada. (1985). *Canada yearbook 1985*. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Statistics Canada. (1985). *Canadian crime statistics*. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.

Steers, R. M. (1981). *Introduction to organizational behavior*. Illinois: Scott, Foresman.

Stevenson, G. (1985). Politics. In J. H. Marsh (Ed.), *The Canadian encyclopedia* (p. 1446). Edmonton, AB: Hurtig.

Taylor, C. (1985). Conservatism. In J. H. Marsh (Ed.), *The Canadian encyclopedia* (p. 404). Edmonton, AB: Hurtig.

Willms, A. M. (1985). The executive and the departmental structure. In K. Kernaghan (Ed.), *Public administration in Canada, selected readings* (5th ed., pp. 108-112). Toronto: Methuen.

Wolcott, H. F. (1985). On ethnographic intent. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21(3), 187-203.

Wood, D. G. (1985). *The Lougheed legacy*. Toronto: Key Porter Books.

Worth, W. H. (1986). Political primer for college board members. *The Canadian Administrator*, 26(3), 1.

APPENDIX 1

September 16, 1987

Lou D. Hyndman
2000 Oxford Tower
10235 - 101 street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 3G1

Dear Mr Hyndman,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study on the role of the minister of education, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of master of education in the department of educational administration at the University of Alberta. The other two primary participants will be David King and Julian Koziak.

The study seeks to illuminate the role of the minister of education by describing the perceptions of three incumbents about the formal requirements and informal expectations for the position and about how they met them within a particular social-educational context. A more detailed elaboration of purpose is provided in the attached excerpt (yellow) from my thesis proposal.

As previously indicated, this study is being conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines established by the University of Alberta.

Since Mr King, Mr Koziak and you are all well known as previous ministers of education, the protection of your collective anonymity will not be possible. Therefore, I would appreciate your accepting the invitation to review the report of the findings prior to the final preparation of the thesis. On the basis of this review, changes deemed necessary by you will be made by mutual consent between you and me. In addition, if specific quotations or unpublished written material supplied by you are considered for inclusion in the study, permission will be specifically sought for their use.

This letter also serves to confirm the dates we established on the telephone on September 8, for the two, one-hour interviews which will constitute the primary source of data for the study. The first interview is scheduled for **September 28, at 3 pm**, in your office. The second interview is scheduled for **October 19, at 3 pm**, again in your office. I seek your permission for the use of a tape recorder for at least part of the interviews to provide a backup for the notes I will take. A copy of the interview guide (green) covering both sessions is enclosed as requested. I hope that we can deal with parts I through IV in our initial session.

My home telephone number in Fort Saskatchewan is 998-4342. My thesis advisor is Dr. Wally Worth. His office telephone number at the University of Alberta is 432-4906. Please feel free to contact me or Dr. Worth regarding any aspect of the study.

Thank you for your interest and cooperation,

Sincerely,

Allan Jamha
8018 - 100 Avenue
Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta
T8L 3K3

cc Dr Wally Worth

September 16, 1987

David T. King
2301 - Royal Trust Tower
Edmonton Centre
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 2Z2

Dear Mr King,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study on the role of the minister of education, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of master of education in the department of educational administration at the University of Alberta. The other two primary participants will be Lou Hyndman and Julian Koziak.

The study seeks to illuminate the role of the minister of education by describing the perceptions of three incumbents about the formal requirements and informal expectations for the position and about how they met them within a particular social-educational context. A more detailed elaboration of purpose is provided in the attached excerpt (yellow) from my thesis proposal.

As previously indicated, this study is being conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines established by the University of Alberta.

Since Mr Hyndman, Mr Koziak and you are all well known as previous ministers of education, the protection of your collective anonymity will not be possible. Therefore, I would appreciate your accepting the invitation to review the report of the findings prior to the final preparation of the thesis. On the basis of this review, changes deemed necessary by you will be made by mutual consent between you and me. In addition, if specific quotations or unpublished written material supplied by you are considered for inclusion in the study, permission will be specifically sought for their use.

This letter also serves to confirm the dates we established on the telephone on September 8, for the two, one-hour interviews which will constitute the primary source of data for the study. The first interview is scheduled for **Friday, October 2, at 9:30 am**, in your office. The second interview is scheduled for **Tuesday, October 20, at 9:30 am**, again in your office. Thank you for your permission to use a tape recorder during the interviews. A copy of the interview guide (green) covering both sessions is enclosed as requested. It is hoped that we can deal with parts I through IV in our initial session.

My home telephone number in Fort Saskatchewan is 998-4342. My thesis advisor is Dr. Wally Worth. His office telephone number at the University of Alberta is 432-4906. Please feel free to contact me or Dr. Worth regarding any aspect of the study.

Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Allan Jamha
8018 - 100 Avenue
Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta
T8L 3K3

cc Dr Wally Worth

September 16, 1987

Julian G J Koziak
le Chateau Louis Motor Inn
11727 Kingsway Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T5G 3A1

Dear Mr Koziak,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study on the role of the minister of education, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of master of education in the department of educational administration at the University of Alberta. The other two primary participants will be Lou Hyndman and David King.

The study seeks to illuminate the role of the minister of education by describing the perceptions of three incumbents about the formal requirements and informal expectations for the position and about how they met them within a particular social-educational context. A more detailed elaboration of purpose is provided in the attached excerpt (yellow) from my thesis proposal.

As previously indicated, this study is being conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines established by the University of Alberta.

Since Mr Hyndman, Mr King and you are all well known as previous ministers of education, the protection of your collective anonymity will not be possible. Therefore, I would appreciate your accepting the invitation to review the report of the findings prior to the final preparation of the thesis. On the basis of this review, changes deemed necessary by you will be made by mutual consent between you and me. In addition, if specific quotations or unpublished written material supplied by you are considered for inclusion in the study, permission will be specifically sought for their use.

I presume from our conversation on September 8, that due to your commitments at the radio station, afternoons, say at 1pm or later would be best for the two, one-hour interviews which will constitute the primary source of data for my study. Any one of the following dates for the first interview is good for me:

Monday, October 5
Wednesday, October 7
Thursday, October 8
Friday, October 9

For the second interview, I suggest the following:
Wednesday, October 21
Thursday, October 22
Friday, October 23

I will call your office to confirm the time and dates or I can be contacted at 998-4342 in Fort Saskatchewan.

Thank you for your permission to use a tape recorder during the interviews to provide a backup for the notes I will take. A copy of the interview guide (green) covering both sessions is enclosed as requested. It is hoped that we can deal with parts I through IV in our initial session.

My thesis advisor is Dr. Wally Worth. His office telephone number at the University of Alberta is 432-4906. Please feel free to contact me or Dr. Worth regarding any aspect of the study.

Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Allan Jamha
8018 - 100 Avenue
Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta
T8L 3K3

cc Dr Wally Worth

June 28, 1988

Lou D. Hyndman
2000 Oxford Tower
10235 - 101 street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 3G1

Same letter to King and Koziak

Dear Mr Hyndman,

My thesis on the role of the minister of education in Alberta is nearing completion and I wish to thank you for your time and assistance during the interviews I held with you last fall. It has been interesting work throughout and would not have been possible without your cooperation.

When we met for the interviews, I promised to provide you with an opportunity to review, and give your permission for the use of, the findings in the study that cited your responses, and other material personally related to you, prior to the preparation of the final copy for my thesis committee. I am now at that stage and the extracts for your consideration are enclosed.

Would you please look them over carefully and contact me before July 22 with any changes or additions you think are necessary. You can reach me at home until July 17 at 998-4342 or you may leave a message with my secretary, Brenda, at 453-2411 and I will return your call.

Sincerely

Allan Jamha
8018 - 100 Avenue
Fort Saskatchewan, Alberta
T8L 3K3

cc Dr Wally Worth

APPENDIX 2

A Study of the Role of the Minister of Education in Alberta
MEd Thesis, Allan Jamha, Fall 1987

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Part I -- General

1. Why do you think you were asked by Premier Lougheed to serve as the minister of education?

2. How would you describe the educational climate in Alberta when you became minister?

3. What were the major issues of the day in education?

4. What goals or aspirations did you set for yourself when you became minister of education?

Part II -- Government Dimension

A. Formally Prescribed Requirements

1. When you took office as minister of education you were sworn in with the following declaration:

> " I, _____, do solemnly and sincerely promise and swear that I will duly and faithfully and to the best of my skill and knowledge execute the powers and trusts reposed in me as minister of education, for the province of Alberta. So help me God."

What "powers and trusts" were you being asked to execute?

2. You also swore the oath of members of the executive council. What formally prescribed requirements were there for the minister of education as a member of the cabinet?

B. Informal Expectations

1. In addition to the formal requirements, what did you perceive was expected of the minister of education:
   a) as a member of the cabinet?
   b) in relation to the caucus?
   c) with respect to the education committee of cabinet and subsequently the education committee of government caucus?

C. Role Behavior

1. How would you describe your style of operation as a minister in the government?

2. What was your relationship with other ministers? Other government MLAs?

3. What were your responsibilities on the Council of Ministers of Education in Canada?

Part III -- Legislature Dimension

A. Formally Prescribed Requirements

1. As minister of education what were your formal responsibilities in the legislature?

B. Informal Expectations

1. The doctrine of ministerial responsibility in Canada based on the British model, expects that the minister is accountable to the Legislative Assembly for his actions and the actions of his department. As minister of education, how did you interpret this convention?

2. In addition to the formal requirements, what did you perceive was expected of you in the legislature by:
   a) the premier and other members of the government?
   b) the opposition?
   c) the speaker?
   d) your constituents?

C. Role Behavior

1. How would you describe your style of operation in the legislature?

Part IV -- Party Dimension

A. Formally Prescribed Requirements

1. Please explain the relation between party policy and government policy in regard to education.

2. What were the formal responsibilities of the minister of education in relation to the party?

B. Informal Expectations

1. What was expected of you at party meetings as minister of education?

C. Role Behavior

1. How did you handle wearing the two hats of MLA and minister of education in your constituency?

Part V -- Department of Education Dimension

A. Formally Prescribed Requirements

1. The Department of Education Act states in part that

> "There shall be a department of the government called the department of education over which shall preside the member of the Executive Council appointed by the Lieutenant Governor under the Great Seal of the Province as the minister of education."

What did "preside over" mean in this context?

2. In which of the following statutes did you have major involvement during your term as minister of education? Minor involvement only?

a. Local Authorities Election Act
b. Teaching Profession Act
c. Teachers' Retirement Fund Act
d. Students Loan Guarantee Act
e. Students Finance Act
f. Colleges Act
g. Universities Act
h. Northland School Division Act
i. School Buildings Act
j. Alberta School Trustees Association Act
k. Alberta Educational Communications Corporation Act
l. Municipal and School Administration Act
m. County Act
n. Municipal Taxation Act
o. Municipal Assessment & Equalization Act
p. Northern Development Act
q. Metis Betterment Act
r. Education of Service Men's Children Act
s. Others _____

(Note: This is a current list of statutes in which the minister of education is cited or may have an interest. All entries may not be applicable to the time period in question for each participant.)

3. With regard to the Acts above for which you indicated major involvement, please give some examples of the ministerial powers which you exercised yourself and examples of responsibilities which were delegated to the deputy minister or others.

B. Informal Expectations

1. In addition to the formal requirements, what did you perceive was expected of you by the staff in the department of education?

C. Role Behavior

1. Who was responsible for the selection of deputy minister when you were the minister? How were the deputy's responsibilities determined?

2. Who selected the staff and specified the duties for positions in the department under the deputy?

3. How would you describe your relationship with the deputy minister? With other staff in the department of education?

Part VI -- Public Dimension

A. Formally Prescribed Requirements

1. What were the formal functions of the minister of education in relation to:
    a) teachers and The Alberta Teachers' Association?
    b) school boards and The Alberta School Trustees' Association?
    c) other interest groups?
    d) the general public?
    e) the mass media?

B. Informal Expectations

1. In addition to the formal requirements, what did you perceive was expected of you by:
    a) teachers and The Alberta Teachers' Association?
    b) school boards and The Alberta School Trustees' Association?
    c) other interest groups?
    d) the general public?
    e) the mass media?

C. Role Behavior

1. How would you describe your relationship with:
   a) teachers and The Alberta Teachers' Association?
   b) school boards and The Alberta School Trustees' Association?
   c) other interest groups?
   d) the general public?
   e) the mass media?

2. In your estimation, how much influence did the various interest groups have on you as minister? What degree of influence was evident on other members of the government?

Part VII -- Other

1. While you were the minister, how would you describe your style of leadership?

2. What factors most affected your options or choices as minister of education?

3. Considering your achievements as minister of education, of which are you most proud?

4. If you were asked to describe the role of minister of education in one sentence, what would you say?

5. Please describe the time demands required of the minister of education.

6. Who or what was most influential in your development as minister of education?

7. Are there speeches or papers of yours which will be helpful to me in completing this study?

Thank you for your time and cooperation in this endeavor.

Allan Jamha 16/9/87.

(excerpted from the thesis proposal "A Study of the Role of the Minister of Education in Alberta" by Allan Jamha, June 20,1987.)

INTRODUCTION

The position of minister of education is at the apex of the governing organization of basic education in the each of the provinces and the territories of Canada. As such it is crucial to the organization and well being of the education system. Strangely enough it is also the position which has received the least attention from researchers. Numerous studies have been conducted on all the appointed positions in education from the deputy minister down, with superintendents of schools heading the list of most sought after subjects. The role of elected school boards has also been the focus of much attention in the literature. In comparison, the position of minister of education has not been the subject of any major research effort at the graduate level in Canada.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine the role of minister of education in Alberta from 1971 to 1986.

Specific Problems to be Addressed

As part of this endeavor, the following problems will be studied:

1. What were the salient features of the context within which the ministers of education in Alberta carried out their roles?

2. What were the role requirements of the position of minister of education in Alberta from 1971 to 1986 in terms of:

   a) formal prescription? b) informal expectations?

3. How did the minister of education translate the role requirements into action?

4. What were the similarities and differences of the role requirements and the role behavior among the three ministers of education who held the position from 1971 to 1986?

5. What composite picture of the role of minister of education emerges?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions will be used in this study:

Position -- is defined as the location of a person or class of persons in a system of social relationships.

Role -- is defined as the combination of what a person is or is not supposed to do (requirements) and what a person actually does (behavior).

Role Requirements -- are defined as the formal prescription of the role as set out in statutes and other legal descriptions plus the informal expectations of significant others.

Role Behavior -- is defined as actions or interactions conducted by the person occupying the role.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

There are reasons for the lack of attention to the role of the minister of education, including the reservation by researchers to study the political aspects of organizations, the transitory nature of political incumbents and the prescriptive delineation of the position in the statutes resulting from the delegation of the control of education to the provinces by the Fathers of Confederation. This latter reason results in a belief by some that all which could be said about the role of minister of education is in the legislation.

This study has both theoretical and practical significance. From a theoretical viewpoint the study may result in a replicable framework within which other political leaders in education and in other fields may be studied. In practical terms, the study is intended to contribute to the literature on educational governance. By taking an historical perspective, the study may add to the knowledge of the political aspects of education in the past. It may also result in a better understanding of the role of the minister of education in the present. By providing an insight into the practical workings of government as they relate to education in the province of Alberta, the study may be helpful to educators and others in the community who have occasion to interact with the office of the minister of education.

APPENDIX 3

STATEMENT ON PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST BY MINISTERS

(Lougheed, 1973)

Whereas it is desirable that the people of Alberta be informed of ministers' property interests to ensure that they will be aware of any possible conflicts between a minister's obligations and duties to the public and the minister's personal interests, I have directed that all ministers shall file on or before July 1,1973, with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly a statement, which will be available for public inspection, showing:

1. A legal description of all land in Alberta, including mineral rights, in which they or their families have any direct or indirect interest, whether as owner, lessee, mortgagee, unpaid vendor, shareholder of a private company or otherwise.

2. The names of all private companies doing business in Alberta in which they or their families have a financial interest.

3. A description of all proprietorships and partnerships doing business in Alberta in which they or their families have an interest.

Ministers will keep the above statements up to date by filing amendments at the time of any additions or deletions. The phrase "their families" in this statement means the minister's spouse and minor children.

In addition, ministers shall not own, directly or indirectly, shares in any public company whose business might be materially affected by the decisions of the Government of Alberta. Ministers have, however, the option of establishing a trust upon the condition that the minister exercise no influence whatsoever over the investment or management decisions of the trust and with all such decisions to be at the discretion of the trustee. If that is done there shall be no restriction on the trustee's right to purchase shares.

These disclosures and restraints are over and above those contained within The Legislative Assembly Act which, among other things, governs dealing between members of the Legislative Assembly and the government.

In addition, senior civil servants who occupy positions where their private business interests might lead to an apparent or actual conflict with government activities will be required to disclose to the Premier, through the minister to whom they are responsible, their personal interests so that the government would be aware of any possible conflict of interest.